Ross Dowson – Correspondence – Year 1972

01_5	Document: **"Canada & the Civil War in Spain; A suppressed page in Canadian history,"** by R.D. (In tribute to Henry Scott Beattie, veteran of the Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion; Trotskyists screened out; C.P. betrayed revolution) See: Labor Challenge, #57 June 5, 1972
01_25	+Circular letter to Branches, locals and members at large, re: Latin American Defense Work, on initiative of the IEC-FI centered on saving the life of Hugo Blanco in Peru
01_28	+Statement of the LSA/LSO Central Office: postponement of project for a theoretical journal until Fall
01_29	+Minutes of Political Committee: membership, Hamilton next priority for a new branch, Abortion (rights) campaign
02_01	+**Statement** of LSA Branch Executive: proposal to split the branch into two Toronto locals
02_14	+Minutes of Political Committee: Kent (R.D.) report on membership; future plenums and convention
02_25	+Circular letter to all branches and members at large, re: launching actions in support of the Irish struggle, our participation in the local Irish Solidarity Cttee; we are encountering some red-baiting
03_28	Letter to Dick (P?), Vancouver, re: short note prior to the plenum
04_00	Document: undated, in April: **''Memorandum by RD``** re: Montreal comrades urging them to support national bureau decision to not expel but suspend the two members (a political error)
04_09	+Circular letter *(likely from major camp enthusiast R.D.)* to all branches, locals and members at large, re: Camp Poundmaker, calling for volunteer for construction, landscaping and staff
05_17	Pamphlet, text of speech by RD to St. George NDP Association meeting: **''Trotskyism and the NDP,"** rebuts smears by party leaders; LSA unconditional support for NDP despite inadequate program and it`s dogmatic parliamentarism
05_24	Document: **''Call for the 1972 Pan-Canadian convention of the LSA/LSO"** (early September at Waterloo ON): agenda, pre-convention discussion, representation and attendance

05_24B +(Attached) Letter to CEC, YS/LJS: Convention planned just before LSA/LSO convention; duplication of tendency documents, therefore PC suspending normal obligation of LSA/LSO members to defend adult organization positions in the interest of free discussion

05_25 +Letter to CC members from Political Committee LSA/LSO: enclosed is United Secretariat of FI statement on the Sallustro kidnapping, disapproving of the positions of the *Militant* (SWP) and *Labor Challenge,* not for public circulation; Document: **The United Secretariat stand on the Sallustro kidnapping,** a Statement by the PC of the LSA/LSO: deny *Militant* and *LC* statements are "attacks," deny no solidarity stated with victims, defending long-held positions against terrorism; US-FI has evaded taking clear position on kidnapping, US-FI gag order on criticism unacceptable

05_31 +Circular flyer *(unsigned, by R.D., camp organizer)* "Spend your vacation in beautiful Tyendinaga (at) Camp Poundmaker" where staff is waiting; camping and magnificent touring available

06_08 Letter to Art (Y.), Halifax: on Jacquie (H.) as paper editor, RD`s move off the bureau and his role in the movement

06_10 Document: **''Some notes on the youth press"** by Kent (RD) re: need to continue publication of *Young Socialist t*o reflect continued needs to meet youth radicalization, its complementary role in supporting *Labor Challenge*

06_27 Document: **Reply by R.D., Executive Secretary LSA to the United Secretariat of the Fourth International,** comrades, re: appeal by Unified Tendency of Canadian section; the Tendency's request for ''an investigation into the internal democratic life of the LSA,'' and response by the LSA

06_27B Letter to the *ISR* (*International Socialist Review),* the influential theoretical journal of the SWP, New York), comrades, re: article on USSR overlooked the national question inside the USSR

07_03 Letter to Keith (Locke), New Zealand, re: position of US-FI majority on Bolivia despite debacle there; the IMG ''stew'' in Britain; the withdrawal of the Quebec document before the Canadian convention; Quebec; the NDP leadership attack against Waffle

07_05 Letter to Brian (Canadian B? in New York), re: on the Quebec document, big weekend at the Camp

07_11 R.D.'s handwritten "Notes which I gave to Gary & out of which came his July 11 Memorandum" re: why we use the term "Canadian nationalism" which also defined Waffle's fundamental character

07_12 Letter to Dick (P?), Vancouver, re: financial arrangements and loan/grant; development of the Camp; RD`s own financial needs and modest lifestyle

07_13 Letter to George Novack (SWP) New York, re: Novack urged to take up a study of Gramsci for the benefit of the New Left

07_18 Letter to Colleen (L., Montreal) re: news of Quebec minority split, possibly for the benefit of the International; they are a disloyal tendency seeking recognition as a sympathizing group

07_19 Letter to Ken (--?), Sudbury, re: desertion of the Mill tendency in Montreal

07_28 Letter to Art (Y.) & Penny, Halifax, re: theft of subscription records

07_31 Letter to Gord Doctorow, re: problems with the new movement trade union caucus; remarks re other active members; the Barnes (SWP) document on Canadian nationalism; the LSA leadership`s dumping of the 1970 positions on the NDP and nationalism

08_06 Memorandum on the August issue of *LC* by R.D. plus notes; a reversal of the anti-US imperialism line of the movement since 1968

08_08 +Letter to Murray & Jeannette (Dowson): re: his intention to buy a lot at the Camp, or not

08_14 Letter to Bryan (B?), New York, re: center matters

08_14B Document: **''Memorandum on the August issue of *Labor Challenge*:``** on its reversal of the 1968 LSA position on Canada-U.S. relations

08_22 Letter to Dick (P.?), Vancouver, re: the Laxer-Watkins split-away; Socialist Caucus gains in NDP

08_22B Letter to Allan (Harris) and Connie, England, re: their missing visiting Toronto; the Camp, Crescent books; withdrawal of Quebec document and revisions to PC political resolution; dealing with the RCT and ultraleft in the SC, and *Old Mole*-Red Circle and IMG line on Quebec; the Mill split-off in Quebec

08_22C Letter to Toni (F.) and Frank, Nottingham (England) re: the Waffle split and our gains in Socialist Caucus; developments in the IMG

08_22D Letter to Mr. Crossthwaite, Toronto Public Library, re: RD`s archives placed & microfilm archives; list of movement publications

08_24 **Memorandum 1** on August issue of *LC:* RD states reversal of line of movement on Canada-US relations, evades role of nationalism in radicalization; **Memorandum 2**: line of LC indicates unilateral change in LSA policy behind backs of movement

09_07 Letter to Bert Groves, Harry Clairmont & Joe Silver, re: invitation to them to contribute to biography of Jack MacDonald (founding member of CPC and Canadian Trotskyism)

09_08 Letter to Comrade Gerry Diamond, Vancouver, re: RD`s father as a unionist and RD`s early days in the movement; his role in the 1921 Typographers` strike in Toronto and the move to offset printing; the significance of the union label today and movement policy

09_30 Personal note to self, re: frank discussion with John (R.) over crisis in movement with leadership rejection of 1968 positions on Canada-US Relations; RD`s doubts about his method of discussing

10_01 Personal note to self, re: PC meeting over proposal to name RD (LSA) chairman; reaction of comrades; discussion on the press; feeling of crisis over a number of issues

10_01B +Minutes of Political Committee: a PC member (Saunders) declares his support for the (ultraleft) RCT, R.D. elected Chairman of LSA/LSO; *Attachment:* "Statement for referral of motion to elect R.D. as Chairman" by Saunders; *Attachment:* "Statement by Crandall" (J.R.) in defence of nomination of R.D. as Chairman

10_03 Personal note to self, re: East Toronto branch meeting: Peter H.`s report of Left Caucus and suggestion Red Circle join LSA; will leadership engage in NDP election campaign; confusion on attitude toward women`s liberation work; absence of organized ultralefts; RD doubts utility of role in movement

10_04 Letter to Milton Alvin (SWP), Los Angeles, re: refusal by York University to allow Mazieros take up his post

10_16 Personal note to self, re: futility of RD`s motions on procedure at the PC meeting; leadership maneuvering questions of the press and women`s liberation policy changes; RD abandons responsibility to answer *Old Mole* tendency

10_29 Document: to the Political Committee (LSA) **‘’Memorandum II on *Labor Challenge*;”** re: alarm at the reversal of 1968 convention line on Canada-US Relations without discussion or explanation to the movement; it`s omission to apply this line in describing the anti-US imperialist aspects of the NDP election program

10_98 Speech to LSA/LSO Plenum: Political Report: RD proposes to write comprehensive overview of movement politics as extensions and in harmony with past movement policies; clarification needed on Canadian nationalism and on Quebec

10_99 Ancillary speech to Plenum on Crescent (publications): the need to expand our English and French-language pamphlets for distribution in mainstream bookstores

11_00- Documents from LSA Discussion Bulletin #15, November 1972:

11_01 *Oct. 26, 1971:* ‘’Letter from Ross Dowson to Walter D. and Will O.’’ reporting PC motions reinstating four Maritime members with a statement of censure

11_02 Oct. 30, 1971: ‘’Reply by the Political Committee to the Mill Appeal’’ (signed R.D.): in response to a request from the U.S. of the F.I. for the views of the Canadian section, signed R. Dowson for the PC-LSA/LSO

11_03 (Appendix) Item 12 (b) July 28, 1971: ‘’ Ross Dowson to Walter D.’’ including discussion on our NDP orientation vs. our revolutionary program

11_03 Sept. 1, 1971: ‘’Ross Dowson to Walter D.;’’ enclosing PC decisions on various movement positions and declining their request to set up a branch

11_03 Oct. 4, 1971: ‘’Ross Dowson to Will O.:’’ PC decision to suspend two comrades while laying charges against all four under the constitution

11_03 Nov. 12, 1971: ‘’ Ross Dowson to Will O.:’’ motivation for sending comrades Art and Penny to Halifax

11_03 Dec. 9, 1971: ‘’Ross Dowson to Will O.;’’ clarifying the status of the YS/LJS vis-à-vis the International and the Canadian section; asking for clarity on nature of their appeal

11_03 Jan. 12, 1972: ‘’Ross Dowson to Walter D.;’’ Bureau declining request that the LSA circulate their YS appeal

11_03 March 15, 1972: ‘’Ross Dowson to Will O. and Walter D.;’’ declining their

request for a statement at the upcoming Plenum; inviting them to send written request for a time for an appeal on the suspensions at the Plenum

11_03 March 24, 1972: ‘’Ross Dowson to Walter D.;’’ declining their request for additional representation of the United Minority Tendency in Montreal; noting acceptance of the time of request for their appeal of their suspensions

11_08 Letter to Keith & Faye Thompson, London, England, re: on the recruitment of ultraleftist Will (O.) to the LSA

11_14 Document: **Statement on draft resolution on ``Canada and the crisis of world imperialism;``** from the leadership argues reactionary nature of Canadian nationalism; fails to deal with domination of Canadian economy by the U.S., signed Kent & Marlon

11_14B Letter to Dick (P.) Vancouver, re: strong left NDP election campaign

11_15 Letter to Jack Barnes (SWP, New York); personal, re: sending him his memorandum ‘’On the press’’ and a letter explaining his absence from a United Secretariat meeting and attitude toward new leadership line on Canada-US Relations

11_25 Letter to Reba and Joe (Hansen, SWP, New York), re: a good CBC radio program on Leon Trotsky; a few words on most important discussion ever coming up in the Canadian section

11_25B Letter to Mitch (P.), Winnipeg re: his fine organizing of the CBC program on L.T.

11_29 Note to self, re the PC meeting, re: crash meeting to vote on the Quebec document, with revisions that RD supports; RD declines to attend IEC meeting; his now total isolation from the LSA leadership; discussion with Gord D. and others re new ultraleft line on daycare

11_29B +Document: **Statement on the PC minutes of November 29, 1972** by P. Kent R.D.)**,** re: two errors of fact; submitting an attachment to correct them, re: 1) the reason for his non-attendance of the IEC meeting and 2) his three proposals as amendments to the Quebec resolution not recorded as unanimously agreed upon)

11_99 Document in LSA/LSO DB #18, November: **“A step backward instead of forward”** incl. Appendix: **Kent-Marlon Statement** on leadership faction Draft Resolution **‘’Canada and the Crisis of World Imperialism;** a defence of the 1968 adopted policy viewing Canadian nationalism as progressive and anti-US imperialism ***See*** ’’Canadian Nationalism’’ section

12_01 Letter to George Breitman (SWP, Detroit), re: with his work on the national question in the SWP, any comments he might have as regards Canadian nationalist sentiment

12_01B Letter to Ralph Starr, Ottawa, re: his raising serious questions about the direction of the movement and publicly declaring his solidarity

12_05 Note to self, re: his 3-hour talk with John (R.) on factional political situation and severe personnel problems; general paralysis and unprincipled political arguments – where are we going?

12_07 Note to self, re: Meeting of East End Branch (LSA); reports on talks with Red Circle; critique of line *Labor Challenge;* attack on Ross over the childcare issue backfires as leadership suffers defeat; discussion and agreement with Gord Doctorow; details of childcare arguments tending to super-revolutionary bent; report on NDP line in LC; RD holds back on input to Political resolution

12_08 Letter to Dick (P?), Vancouver, re: Toronto civic election results

12_18 Note to self, re: blow-up meeting with Dick (F.) over leadership working out political differences with RD; stalemate and maneuvers

12_20 Letter to Jack (Barnes), SWP C.C. calling attention to CBC radio program on LT (for Joe Hansen); LSA internal discussion bulletins becoming available for George (Novack) and George Breitman

12_25 Letter to Brian W., Vancouver, re: welcoming support (for LPT) from him and Nick (S.), sectarian activities of centre on women`s liberation and antiwar issues; agreement on Quebec document despite criticisms; working on economic analysis document

12_97 Undated Note to self, in 1972: ‘’What the RCT (ultraleft) has to say on Canadian nationalism – bulletin 45:” their view it is a petty-bourgeois current (only objectively reactionary), as ‘’new,`` not bourgeois.

12_98 Undated letter fragment (page 3, in 1972) signed RD, re: Mandel`s sweeping attack on the International minority and particularly the Canadian section

12_99 Undated speech, transcribed from original tapes (text available on website) **‘’How Canada can break from the U.S. empire``** ***See:*** ‘’Canadian Nationalism”

LSA/LSO Central Office
334 Queen Street West
Toronto, Ont.
January 25, 1972

To Branches, locals and members at large

Re: Latin American Defense Work

Dear Comrades:

Repression against the left, by Latin American governments has intensified considerably. It includes the victimization of many of our own comrades.

The last meeting of the International Executive Committee of the Fourth International, projected an international campaign to be carried by our movement in defense of Latin American political prisoners. This campaign follows in the tradition of the successful campaign our movement waged to save Hugo Blance from being murdered by the Peruvian dictatorship.

In the United States, the United States Latin American Justice Committee has been reactivated. This committee which has a broad list of prominent sponsors and its own publication, the USLA Reporter, carried its last big campaign around the defence of the Mexican students who were under severe repression from the Mexican government in 1968. The USLA Justice Committee is now launching a campaign against the repression in Argentina.

We want to begin this work in Canada now by building a Canadian Latin American Justice Committee which would function as an integral part of the USLA Justice Committee.

Our work in defense of the Cuban revolution, in aid of Hugo Blance and in defense of the Quebec Political Prisoners should be useful in helping us to bring together persons interested in the Latin American political situation.

Possibilities for such a committee are considerable. On the campus, in the NDP and Waffle, there is wide interest in Canada's ties with the U.S. military and Canadian big business interests in Latin America and the Carribean. Defense of the political prisoners will be of interest in these areas.

The Political Committee is now taking steps to organize this work across the country. Comrade Georgina Cordoba of the Toronto Branch has been assigned to co-ordinate this work. Further information will be sent shortly. In the meantime all branches should assign a capable comrade to this area

comradely

Ross Dowson

LSA- LSO CENTRAL OFFICE
334 Queen St. W., Toronto 2b

Jan. 28, 1972

The Political Committee has had some second thoughts on the publication schedule of our theoretical journal since its circular letter of December 6. We have decided to further postpone the publication of the first issue until the coming fall.

There is no question that we could get Spring and Summer issues out before then. But it would be difficult to allocate the time and energy that are really required to put the journal on a viable basis and to have it, in a consistant way, meet the standards that we all want it to.

As you know this year is a convention year for the LSA/LSO. The pre-convention period and the convention itself is a big challenge before the entire movement. The basic documentation has to be prepared and time and energy allocated for a fruitful participation in the discussions through which we intend to assimilate the experiences of the past two years and from which we will map out and gear all our forces for the way ahead. This will put a severe tax on the central operations of the movement which we noted in the December 6 communication have been considerably shaken up. Since then we have felt it desireable to assign comrade Phil Courneyeur out of the center and into the Vancouver operations until Easter.

We know that the comrades and all friends and sympathizers of the movement who responded so vigourosly to the Waterloo appeal that made the journal a financial possibility will agree to this short delay so as to ensure that the journal meets the standards of Trotskyism.

comradely

Ross Dowson

MINUTES OF POLITICAL COMMITTEE MEETING, JAN. 29,1972, CONVENED 2PM.

Attendance: Chair: Brennan; Secretary: Macdonald; P.C. Present:Brock; Labossiere, Marlon, Fleming, Kent, Brennan, Macdonald, Connolly,Ruby; P.C. Excused: Courtney, Saunders.

Minutes: m/c to adopt minutes of Jan. 20 1972, Political Committee meeting.

Anti-War: Kent reported on personnel; m/c to adopt report.

Membership:m/c to reject Ron G's. for membership at large in LSA/LSO. Report on discussion on Quebec National Committee regarding membership application of Jean Pierre K.; m/c that Kent prepare a report along the lines of our discussion on the circulation of internal documents ; Kent also reported on continued failure of Marie Christine to respond to P.C. request that we open discussion on her work in youth.

Organization: m/c that we see the strengthening of the Hamilton branch as a top priority, that we attempt to work out arrangements so that Hamilton aids the functioning of the St. Catharines branch and that we search out the possibilities of strengthening our forces in Kitchener-Waterloo. m/c that rather then structure a Peterboro branch at this time, we encourage LSA/LSO sympathizers to step up the assimilation of new elements in the youth and that we orient these LSA/LSO supporters in the direction of strengthening the central youth operations and colonizing Hamilton and Kitchener-Waterloo in the next period.

Toronto Branch Division: Connolly reported; discussion; m/c to adopt the general direction of the projected division.

Abortion Campaign: Ruby reported on Ottawa injunction, its implications and the response against it; m/c that a circular be prepared on the impact of this case on the campaign. m/c that Leslie, Butler, Ruby, Robertson and Nelson form a cross-country coordination committee on women's liberation work.

International: Kent reported on reply by United Secretariat to the appeal from Montreal and Maritime minority comrades; m/c to circulate the reply.

New Business:
1. Irish Campaign: Kent reported that Irish Solidarity Campaign is under way.
2. Latin American Defence Work: Kent reported that a first meeting is now projected; m/c that Louise now taking the initiatives in this area be assigned to this work area.

Adjournment: 5.30pm

KEY POINTS OF TORONTO LSA BRANCH EXECUTIVE PROPOSAL FOR RESTRUCTURING OF THE TORONTO LSA

The present stage of the construction of the Vanguard party in Canada is characterized by the need to develop Trotskyist cadre.

Without this cadre, that is persons who through their experience in the Trotskyist movement have developed a high degree of dedication to the task of party building and have acquired a certain degree of skill in implementing the program of Trotskyism in the class struggle itself, the mass revolutionary socialist workers party of which the LSA/LSO is the nucleus, will never be built let alone lead a successful socialist revolution.

The increased numbers of persons we are winning to our ranks does not solve the problem of constructing cadre...it only poses it. Cadre building is our top priority and must be highly conscious planned and organized.

The structure of the Toronto branch with is present size, rather than facilitating the development of cadre, blocks it. The following proposal to restructure our forces is designed to enable us to carry out this work more effectively so we can begin to take advantage of our growth to construct party cadres not only for the Toronto area but for the pan Canadian movement as a whole.

Within the framework of the LSA/LSO constitution, which provides us with a guide, the following 7 points constitute the basic aspects of the proposed change.

1) The majority of comrades are to be divided into 2 branches... a west and east branch, with Spadina Ave. as the boundary line.

2) The Richmond Hill branch which includes some comrades living in north Metro, is to be expanded and strehgthened into a York-Richmond Hill branch composed of the Richmond Hill comrades, comrades generally living North of Lawrence and LSA comrades who attend York University.

3) The East-West branches will operate out of the one present central headquarters. The York- Richmond Hill branch will orient to the establishment of a separate headquarters.

4) The East-West branches will be co-ordinated by a metro committee which will include a representative from the York-Richmond Hill Branch.

5) Finances of the branches will be separate. Those of the East West branches will be co-ordinated by a joint financial committee.

6) Fractions will be organized to maintain both the centralized nature of many of the work areas, for example antiwar, as well as to permit each branch to organize its work in a particular area.

7) The present organization of the Young Socialists will not be affected by these changes.

These proposals are consistent with the purpose of the restructuring outlined above. It is important to recognize that the branches will be faced with an increased opportunity to take our campaigns and our movement into the mass working class organizations which cover the metro area through the NDP and the unions. This will provide us with a rich experience with the new structure over the next period and will give us a basis to assess any other steps that might be necessary as our forces continue to grow.

Feb. I, 1972

MINUTES OF POLITICAL COMMITTEE MEETING, FEB. 14, 1972, CONVENED 8PM.

Attendance: Chair: Fleming; Secretary: Macdonald; P.C. Present: Brock, Fleming, Labossiere, Marlon, Brennan, Connolly, Kent, Saunders, Ruby, Macdonald; P.C. Excused: Courtney; m/c that Mike be invited to attend Political Committee meetings as representative of the Y.S.
Minutes: m/c to adopt the minutes of the Political Committee Meeting of Jan. 29, 1972.

Membership: Kent reported;
m/c that we accept Moore's resignation from the LSA/LSO
m/c that John F's transfer from Vancouver to Edmonton be accepted.
m/c that Natalie's resignation from the LSA/LSO be accepted.
m/c that John C's transfer from Saskatoon to member at large in Regina be accepted.
m/c that Roma E's reapplication be accepted, as recommended by the Toronto Branch Executive.
Kent reported on discussions in Peterboro.

Convention: Kent reported; m/c that we investigate the possibilities on campuses in the Southern Ontario area for a convention in late summer.

Plenum: m/c that a plenum be held March 31 to April 2; m/c that the Political Bureau prepare an outline for the Convention documentation for the next Political Committee meeting, so as to allow drafts to be prepared for the Easter Plenum.

Mandel Tour: Kent reported; m/c to adopt the report.

Irish Work: Connolly reported on possibilities for a very large and broad defence campaign, led by Irish Civil Liberties activists.

Waffle Conference: Brock reported; discussion; m/c to refer further discussion to a future Political Committee meeting.

Adjournment: 11pm.

February 25, 1972
Toronto
334 Queen Street W

To all branches and members at large
Dear Comrades;

Several branches have taken the initiative to launch actions in support of the Irish struggle, including the structuring of solidarity committees. In other places support actions have taken place carried by Irish militants who have never before appeared in the traditional left circles. There are strong feelings amongst Irish-Canadians for the need of solidarity committees and such committees tend to take shape with very little stimulation on our part or completely outside of us.

It is obvious that there is a very rapid radicalization taking place amongst Irish -Canadians across the country and that Irish solidarity committees have real possibilities of waging effective campaigns to win symapathy and support for the Irish revolution. It is also clear that there are good possibilities of winning Irish workers being radicalized by the struggle in Ireland very close to [illegible] and right into the ranks of those struggling to make the revolution in Canada--into the ranks of the LSA/LSO

It is still too early to draw many broad conclusions but it would appear that this radicalization of Irish-Canadians is taking place quite outside of all the existing forms of the current radicalization, that it is somewhat closed off and ethnic in character, and on top of this, there is an overriding atmosphere of suspicion of other radicals, and considerable pressure from conservative and obscurantist forces to have nothing to do with them.

This in our opinion requires us to move out in this area with some care, Too precipitate action on our part, particularly at this stage, could result in our being cut off from a movement that is developing and appears to have big possibilities, and even curtail the development of such a movement.

With strong backing from the League, the Vancouver Irish Repulbican Club has served as a stepping off point towards the formation of an Irish Solidarity Committee which will have its first meeting on February 23. This meeting follows a highly successful rally called by the Irish Republican Club attended by some 400 people with a very wide spectrum of opinion represented on the platform. The formation of the IRC was announced there.

Some days before Bloody Sunday some Toronto Irish militants with the support of the League announced a public rally to launch an Irish Solidarity Committee. Mary Cotter of the Irish Republican Clubs of the U.S., although it was apparent she preferred an Irish Republican Club agreed to speak. Suddnely however it was learned that Northern Aid (supporters of the IRA Provisionals) were holding a mass meeting on the same day and at the same time. It was decided to postpone the Cotter meeting and join the Northern Aid meeting. At that meeting, attended by over 500, another group announced that Ivan Cooper ,Derry M.P., would address a rally several days later. This meeting drew over 1,300 persons, almost all Irish, who responded enthusiastically to Cooper's appeal for the formation of a solidarity movement that would raise funds and organize mass demonstrations around the demands; withdraw British troops, End the internments, and Self-determination for the Irish. Out of this rally the Canadian Association for Justice in Ireland is being formed. Its initial meeting, election of provisional officers, adoption of a constitution and statement of aims, will take place on Febraury 29.

A bloc of our Montreal comrades with the Montreal council of the CSN, the Dawson College Irish Club and the MDPPQ called a march and rally February 5. However 3 or 4 days before the action we learned of a memorial meeting called by a body named Action for Irish Distress. Some 700 came to the church service and 400 marched to the British consulate in the bitter cold. While the march was silent, picket signs reading Withdraw British Troops, Britain Out of Ireland and Long Live the IRA were carried. Leaflets for the February 5 demo were grabbed up by the demonstrators. But the Feb .5 demonstration was ruined by a raging blizzard.

Some 40 persons marched in Winnipeg on Feb 5 where an announcement of the formation of some type of solidarity committee was made. The meeting came off but attempts to form a committee were frustrated by opposition elements. Our comrades are in the process of encouraging better elements they met on the demo and the meeting to move ahead with the original projection of a solidarity committee.

In view of the fact that there appear to be efforts on a wide basis within the Irish community itself to set up solidarity committees we think our policy should be a cautious one. At this time the Irish Republican Clubs are not structured in Canada although there are many other and diverse forces. Some of them are quite hostile to the Officials--elements around the Toronto Canadian Association for Justice consider it to be "communist". While we defend the Republican clubs and the IRA officials against any kind of redbaiting, they are a defined tendency in the Irish struggle for which we Trotskyistshave no reason to assume responsibility. However the movement at this stage is so strongly ethnic in character that we have difficulties in making an identity with it. In this respct the circulation of the United Irishman by ourselves and persons close to us allows us to make some kind of genuine identity with the Irish struggle and at the same time circulate material much of which we are in agreement with,

The elements around the Toronto Association for Justice for Ireland appear to be very ambitious an d to have intentions of structuring something quite substnatial. It is probable that they will make an attempt to take on a pan-Canadian form. It would be desireable that Irish militants coming together in the various places across the country make contact with the Vancouver committee, and, if things turn out as we hope, with the Toronto committee so that a really broad pan-Canadian solidarity committee can be formed around the four points of the Vancouver committee--self-determination for the Irish nation-immediate withdrawal of British troops from Ireland--abolition of the totalitarian Special Powers Act--immediate release of the internees and other political prisoners. The Vancouver committee address is Denis Bradfield, 1825 Haro Street # 301, Vancouver 5. We will keep you informed of the developments around the Toronto committee.

All branches should be holding public meetings in their own name, with leading comrades billed as speakers on the developing Irish revolution.

comradely

Ross Dowson

March 28, 1972
Toronto

Vancouver;

Dear Dick; (Prinscep)

Good to get your note.

Yes, I showed Kate, our treasurerx the few lines on the loan that you were so good as to make to us. She was off yesterday or your cheque would have been in the mail. This cheque covers the last 50 outstanding so we are now quits. A very good help to us--I see it took us up to the financial drive.

Big things in the student area these days in Toronto --and Peterboro. I would suppos you have been reading it all in the YS. York has blossomed out for us--to a large extent thanks to the good work and inspiration of Brian Belfont. And for the first time in a long time there is some action on the U of T. All very interesting as it seems that generally there has been a slight downturn in the student struggles.

How has Waffle responded to the at ack out in your area. Generally it caught them all off guard here and their line is to carry a counter-defense with what they call a low profile. Interestingly Watkins carries the strongest line with Laxer taking a moderate view. The big problem is that they are not really widely constituency based having taken off for the past period in their Texpac and auto-pact diversions.

Yes, the paper would be considerably improved with some good letters to the editor. Why don't you send us a couple.

Sorry about the shortness of this note---but my back is to the wall right now with the plenum on us in a couple of days

all the best

Ross

Memorandum by RD Plenum Easter/72

You [redacted] comrades (now in Montreal) are now going to have to consider whtehr you should support the action of the national bureau--their decision that instead of expelling Leon and M-C they should be suspended until the convention which would make ~~the~~ that decision.

It seems obvious to me that you must support the national bureau decision. I say this as one who did nothing at all to enable the national bureau to make that decision and by that token demonstrated my opposition to it. As you probably know I went along with the expulsion line when I heard of the Leon and M-C action and if I had been in Montreal would surely have been one of its strongest advocates.

The expulsion line was wrong from the start just looked at from a serious political point of view and I regret that I and no one else stopped to consider this elementary fact. Just look at it from what you could anticipate would be the reaction of the tendency!

Expulsion would have dmeanded that they have nothing at all to do with Leon and M-C-that they would have had to treat them as enemies of the LSA-LSO. Thwy could not do so--and obviously it should have been apparent to anyone who knows anything at all about the tendency that they would not do so.

The expulsion line would have confronted us with a whole series of further violations of discipline by the tendency which would have forced us to carry out a whole further series of disciplinary actions. We would have got tied up with disciplinary actions from here right on into the convention and the operation of the movement would have become a farce

We (including myself) should have been guided by that very tricky and profound dictum--always look before you leap.
or dont say x unless you are prepared to say a-b-c

ross dowson

April 9 1972
334 Queen St. W
Toronto Ont.

To all branches, locals and members at large:
Re: Camp Poundmaker.

Dear Comrades:

This year we intend to make the camp a real operation - both as a vacation area and as an attractive site for educational projects. Not just for Montreal Ottawa and Toronto, which are about 150 miles equidistant from it, but for the whole movement.

Jim Mitchell has been designated manager of the project and will be in residence there. A budget has been established and a self sustaining operation is projected starting the May 24th weekend and running through to the eve of the convention on Labor Day.

We anticipate that branches locals and sympathetic organizations will book weekends. Valuable classes and seminars could be held in a relaxed vacation atmosphere. With improved sleeping facilities and freedom from all but auxilliary help with meals Poundmaker will become a much more attractive facility for the movement.

To realize these conditions we require a force of hardworking comrades to form a team with comrade Jim. We are calling for volunteers from across the country. These comrades will be the basic camp staff and would work on many projects to make the camp more attractive and smooth running. Food and accomodation will be provided. The job pays no money.

Among the many projects are extensive landscaping for tentsites badminton and ball parks, construction and improvement of sleeping facilities. The staff would provide the basic nucleus around which the kitchen teams would be formed. Schedules would be organized so that the staff could relax and conduct its own seminars. An important part of the concept is the staff's study and development time. They would form a miniature Trotsky school in the Mountain Spring Tradition.

These comrades will be making a large contributoon by building our movement and developing themselves as knowledgefull and effective revolutionists.

Volunteers for the project should apply to Jim Mitchell at the Toronto Metro headquarters immediately. It is most desir able to have a team that could operate for the duration. However, we may have to split shifts. Information about the number of weeks you are available, any special skills or experience you may have etc. will be a help to the committee in con sidering applications.

Comradely,

for the camp committee.

labor political action, compromised the very concept itself, and have sunk the NDP as a force in Quebec, which ironically is. key to federal governmental power, for years to come.

The character of the NDP is such that it cannot establish socialism in Canada. Serious socialist forces cannot be built, cannot be educated, gathered together and accumulate essential experiences solely on the basis of NDP activity. The progressive content that resides in the New Democratic party over the next period will be wasted unless the influence of the League for Socialist Action — Ligue Socialiste Ouvriere is widened and its forces strengthened.

This article was reprinted from

labor **Challenge**

Canada's leading socialist newspaper, featuring full coverage of the NDP, the labor movement, Quebec, the antiwar movement, the struggle against the anti-abortion laws, and all the issues and debates in the Canadian and international left.

Subscriptions: $4.00/year (24 issues)

Introductory: $1.00/3 months

Box 5595, Station A, Toronto, Ontario.

Contact the League for Socialist Action and Young Socialists in Ontario:

Guelph: c/o Jim Onyschuk, 108 Woolwich, 822-1035

Hamilton: 182 Locke St. N. 529-8979

Kitchener-Waterloo: Box 921. 576-2293

Orillia: Box 835

Ottawa: c/o Chris Schrenk, 200 Arlington, 238-2943

Peterborough: c/o M. McPhail, 21 Benson, 745-9265

St. Catherines: 8 Lakeside Drive.

Sudbury: Box 383. 675-8177

Toronto: Downtown: 334 Queen St. W., 364-5908.

North Toronto: 5740 Yonge, 221-5425

or, across Canada:

1972 - from E3 RD on LC

LSA - 1972

Trotskyism and the NDP

The following article is based on a speech by Ross Dowson, executive secretary of the League for Socialist Action — Ligue Socialiste Ouvriere to the St. George (Toronto) NDP constituency association meeting of May 17, 1972. Dowson was introduced by David Middleton, president of the constituency association and NDP candidate in the last provincial elections.

Trotskyism has long been an issue in the NDP, and before that, in the CCF. The League for Socialist Action, known among the tendencies on the left as Trotskyist, a term derived from the name of Leon Trotsky who launched on a world-wide scale the struggle against the Stalinist corruption of Marxism-Leninism, thinks that it is inevitable and only correct that Trotskyism should be a continuing issue in the New Democratic Party.

The development of a class analysis of Canadian society and the projection of a socialist solution to the working people of Canada is the Number One challenge before the NDP. Trotskyism, with its developed class struggle program and its revolutionary internationalist strategy, is the only consistent theory of socialism.

Unfortunately this is not the way Trotskyism usually appears, particularly on the official levels of the NDP. The term is most often employed as a bogey — as a smear — a form of redbaiting by the reformist leadership of the party against its left wing opponents in the party.

Uppermost in every NDPers mind right now is the campaign that has been launched by the Ontario party leadership against the broad left wing current called Waffle. The Waffle has been charged with being a party within the party. It would seem clear, from even a superficial examination, that what is involved here is whether tendencies are going to be allowed to exist and effectively advance their ideas up to and including changing official party policy and the leadership — whether the party is going to be genuinely democratic. Along with that charge is another, supplementary, but an equally if not more important charge.

Ontario NDP leader Stephen Lewis charges the Waffle with providing a forum for what he calls "extremists" — like Maoists, and Trotskyists — whose views he characterizes "are not dissent but destruction — not ideological but pathological."

This charge has essentially two purposes: (1) to smear and thus isolate the Waffle with the vicious McCarthyite device of "guilt by association." The Waffle is a haven for Trotskyists, who are smeared as pathological opponents of the party, and thereby must itself be infected with such evil.

And (2) to attempt to divert the Waffle from presenting a common front against its accusers, to try to turn the Waffle in on itself with a witchhunt in its own ranks that might split it and render it impotent before the right wing's assault.

To top it off Lewis throws the Trotskyists into the same heap as

the Maoists. Now of course anyone who walked down Toronto streets during the last election could not help but be aware, from the posters that they slapped up everywhere, that the Maoists consider the Liberals, Tories, Social Credit, along with the trade union-based NDP, to be all the same.

What then is the real attitude of the LSA to the NDP? Its views are readily available in three publications, one in French, Liberation, and two in English, Labor Challenge and Young Socialist. Two of them are monthlies, the other is a twice monthly. This fall we will commence the publication of a theoretical journal.

The position of the LSA with regards to the NDP is one of unconditional support. Prior to the founding of the NDP 11 years ago we conducted a big campaign to convince socialists of all opinions to get into the new party. The LSA was launched on the eve of the formation of the NDP, not as a party, challenging the NDP for the adherence of the working class, but as a league of socialists who took as their fundamental orientation the struggle to win the NDP to a class struggle program and a socialist perspective.

Our position, while laying down no conditions or terms, has nonetheless been of a critical character.

We think that the program of the party is completely inadequate to the needs of the struggle that the working class are involved in against the capitalist rulers of this country. Its fundamental character is reformist. It merely attempts to eliminate some of the worst aspects of the capitalist system, to patch it up, and make it more tolerable. When what we actually need is a revolution, a fundamental change in productive and social relations, and a program that will take the popular struggles forward to the establishment of a new socialist order where the working people will through democratic councils, own and control the productive plant in this country and plan production for use.

The League interprets the support that a growing body of Canadians give to the NDP as not signifying a commitment to reformist ideology but rather as a stage in their political evolution from bourgeois politics, to independent class politics, on the way to socialist action. The leadership of the NDP, however, not necessarily as individuals but as a social category, is quite a different matter. They are convinced reformists, of essentially the same type who in Germany, at the head of a massive social democratic movement, adapted and eventually capitulated, even placing their own heads in the noose of Hitler's hangmen. This can be best illustrated by their dogmatic concept of parliament.

All socialists including revolutionary, class struggle socialists, would prefer the realization of a socialist society by peaceful means. No great transition in history has ever been achieved peacefully — no ruling class heretofore has ever left the stage of history without resorting to the most desperate and most violent struggle — even threatening to take all society down with it. There is no reason to believe that the capitalist class of North America, who resist modest union demands so bitterly, armed with the H-bomb and faced with the loss of the very source of their wealth and power at home, would peacefully depart from the scene should the revolutionary aspirations of the masses rally a majority in a parliamentary election.

The problem is not that the NDP leadership oppose extra-parliamentary action. Under certain circumstances they are prepared to employ it with great vigor — but only as a device, distinctly supplementary — as a form of pressure, to increase their weight in parliament or the weight of parliament itself within the state apparatus.

The NDP leadership affirm parliament and bourgeois electoral politics as the only road to social progress, when the ruling class everywhere have shown themselves in no way committed to parliamentary democracy. In times of crisis they are prepared to treat it as a mere facade covering over the real power structure, hiding the state apparatus constructed to defend bourgeois property — by any means necessary — including force and violence.

We no longer need refer to Spain, Germany or the Winnipeg General Strike and Section 98 — we have the experience of Quebec, October 1970.

By a simple act of four cabinet ministers, after an hour's work on documents signed and dispatched by the governor-general, Canada awoke on an October morning to find the institutions of parliamentary democracy completely swept aside, and the army and police in charge.

The LSA sees parliament and electoral campaigns as an important area of activity, but as a propaganda forum and a test of ideas. For us, the new social order can only be constucted through the self-action of the masses themselves.

The LSA does not pull its program out of the air but shapes it through a scientific analysis of the objective situation in Canada and the world. It finds the elements for its realization in the real forces that are already in struggle against capitalism and are in the process of moving into struggle.

That is why we have given priority to the struggle of opposition to U.S. imperialist aggression against the Vietnamese and Canada's complicity in this war, why we participate with considerable energy in the women's liberation movement and are trying to widen its scope and develop its anticapitalist thrust with those forces that see anti-abortion law repeal as the key issue.

So committed to parliamentarism and to federalism are the NDP leadership that they have blocked the movement across Canada from identifying with the right of self-determination of the Quebecois, and in Quebec itself with independence. Thus they have deprived the Quebecois of the benefit of the Canadian experience in independent

CALL FOR THE 1972 PAN-CANADIAN CONVENTION OF THE
LEAGUE FOR SOCIALIST ACTION-LIGUE SOCIALISTE OUVRIERE

May 24, 1972.

To all locals, branches and members of the LSA/LSO:

Dear comrades,

Pursuant to the provisions of the Constitution of the League (Article X), the Central Committee of the LSA/LSO at the March 31 - April 2 plenum called the 1972 convention of the LSA/LSO for September 2, 3 and 4 in Waterloo, Ontario.

AGENDA

The Political Committee proposes the following agenda for the convention:

International Report
Political Resolution
Quebec Liberation Resolution
Quebec Language Struggle Resolution
Women's Liberation Resolution
Youth Radicalization Resolution
Organizational Report
Election of Central Committee and Control Commission

PRECONVENTION DISCUSSION

The League preconvention discussion is formally opened June 1, 1972. The Internal Discussion Bulletin is open for all League members on the subjects listed in the agenda or others which they may wish to present for the consideration of the League.

The Political Committee has set a deadline of August 22, 1972 for acceptance of preconvention discussion articles for the bulletin. After that date the Central Office will be unable to handle the translation and production of late materials.

Branch membership meetings shall be arranged for discussion of the various subjects on the agenda. Our traditional provisions and safeguards for the adequate and free presentation of all points of view shall govern all discussion.

CONVENTION ASSESSMENT

As authorized by the League constitution, a convention assessment of $8.00 for employed members and $4.00 for students and unemployed members is hereby levied, the payment of which is obligatory and must be made prior to the date of the branch election of delegates, for members to be in good standing.

BASIS OF REPRESENTATION

1. Representation from branches shall be as follows: One delegate for the first five members or less, and one additional delegate for each five additional members or major fraction thereof (3 constituting a major fraction; see appendix).

2. Each branch having three or more members is entitled to a voting delegate.

3. Delegates are to be elected by branches in accordance with the actual number of members in good standing who have been admitted to the League prior to May 31, 1972 and who have paid there convention assessment, as certified by the branch executive committee on the day of voting.

4. Branches organized after May 31, 1972 are entitled to fraternal delegates as provided by the League constitution.

5. Members admitted to the League after May 31, 1972 are entitled to voice in the League discussion but no vote on resolutions or in the selection of delegates.

6. Absentee votes on political resolutions and the election of delegates shall not be permitted except in clearly established cases of occupational necessity (for example, regular night workers, etc.) and for reasons of illness.

7. Regular members of the Central Committee, if not delegates, shall be fraternal delegates to the convention with voice and consultative vote.

8. Members-at-large in good standing may attend the convention as observers but will have no voice or vote.

PROPORTIONAL REPRESENTATION

In case of political differences, defined by conflicting resolutions, the election of delegates in the branches is to be on the basis of the vote on resolution or resolutions voted on at the meeting at which the delegates are elected. Members voting for a given resolution are entitled to designate the delegate or delegates to which they are entitled on the basis of proportional representation laid down in this call, the designations to be ratified by the branch. Abstentions in no case count as votes.

1. If a branch is entitled to one delegate, the delegate goes to the majority of those present and voting at the time of the election.

2. If two delegates, a minority with 40 percent gets one. (a minimum of 40%)

3. If three delegates, a minority with 33-1/3 gets one. (a minimum of 33-1/3%)

4. If four delegates, a minority with a minimum of 25 percent gets one delegate, but a minority with a minimum of 40 percent gets two delegates.

5. If five delegates, a minority with a minimum of 20 percent gets one delegate and a minority with a minimum of 40 percent gets two delegates.

6. If six delegates, a minority with a minimum of 16-2/3 percent gets one delegate, a minority with 33-1/3 percent gets two delegates, but a minority with a minimum of 40 percent gets one-half the delegates, that is three delegates.

In general, if a branch is entitled to N delegates, then a minority is entitled to X delegates if it receives at least X/N of the votes, with the exception that if N is even, a minority receiving at least 40 percent of the vote is entitled to half of the delegates.

CONVENTION ATTENDANCE

The Political Committee proposes that all League members in good standing may attend the convention as visitors and that contacts and sympathizers may be admitted to the sessions provided that they have been invited by a branch.

The Political Committee proposes that all members of the YS/LJS be invited to attend the convention as observers.

Comradely yours,

LSA/LSO CENTRAL COMMITTEE

Ross Dowson
Executive Secretary.

APPENDIX:

The formula for branch representation works out as follows:

A branch of (3 - 7) members, 1 delegate; (8 - 12) 2 delegates; (13 - 17 3 delegates; (18 - 22) 4 delegates; (23 - 27) 5 delegates; (28 - 32) 6 delegates; (33- 37) 7 delegates; (38 -42) 8 delegates; (43 - 47) 9 delegates; (48 - 52) 10 delegates; (53 - 57) 11 delegates; (58 - 62) 12 delegates; and so on.

COPY COPY COPY

May 24 1972
LSA/LSO Central Office
334 Queen Street W.
Toronto 133, Ontario

Central Executive Council
YS/LJS

Dear comrades:

The political committee of the LSA/LSO notes your proposal to hold a convention immediately prior to the convention of the League set for Sept. 2 - 4. We understand the importance of your proposal to hold a convention side by side with our own in light of the unusual situation that confronts both organizations. Important and fundamental political questions have been raised by a minority tendency in both the YS/LJS and the LSA/LSO including an unprecedented occurence - the presentation of substantially the same documents in both organizations.

In the interests of the clearest possible political discussion, clarification and clear decisions on any and all political differences which have already been raised or may arise in the course of the pre-convention discussions in our two organizations, the Political Committee of the LSA/LSO is suspending the normal responsibility of all LSA/LSO members who are members of the YS/LJS to defend the political positions of the League in the preconvention discussion of the YS/LJS. In all other respects the regular responsibilities of LSA/LSO members who are members of the YS/LJS retain their full force.

This decision has been made with the intention of permitting and encouraging the widest and freest discussion of the political issues and political differences within the pre-convention discussion and to remove any barriers to that process.

Comradely

(signed)

Ross Dowson
Executive Secretary, LSA/LSO

The above letter was read and noted at the May 27 - 28 plenum of the Executive Council of the YS/LJS.

Political Committee, LSA-LSO
334 Queen Street W
Toronto 133, Ontario.

May 25/72

To CC members:

Dear comrades,

The enclosed statement of the LSA/LSO Political Committee, "The United Secretariat Stand on the Sallustro Kidnapping" is FOR THE INFORMATION OF C.C MEMBERS ONLY.

The statement is our response to the following motion of the United Secretariat, excerpted from the minutes of the April 15 - 16, 1972 meeting.

"Motion by Pierre:

The United Secretariat of the Fourth International disapproves of the publication in the Militant and Labor Challenge of resolutions adopted by the leaderships of the Socialist Workers Party and the League for Socialist Action/ Ligue Socialiste Ouvriere concerning the kidnapping of Sallustro by the Argentine ERP, the armed organization led by the Partido Revolucionario de los Trabajadores (PRT), Argentine section of the Fourth International.

Such public declarations could well encourage sections to follow this example of public attacks against other sections, which would be highly damaging to the whole International.

In addition, these resolutions do not express any solidarity towards these comrades, at the moment when a fierce campaign is underway against them.

The United Secretariat of the Fourth International resolves not to publish these two resolutions in the International's organs, or in organs expressing its positions.

This resolution is not for public circulation.

Vote: For: 6 (Petersen, Walter, Livio, Kurt, Pierre, Delfin)

Against: 5 (Adair, Pedro, Juan, Hans, Therese

Consultative: For 1 (Biel)
Consultative Against: 1 (Crandall)

Carried "

Comradely

Gary Porter

Organizational Secretary.

Encl:

THE UNITED SECRETARIAT STAND ON THE SALLUSTRO KIDNAPPING

Statement by the Political Committee of the League for Socialist Action-Ligue Socialiste Ouvriere, May 22, 1972.

At its April 15 - 16 meeting the United Secretariat, by majority vote of 6 - 5, took a decision to disapprove the publication in The Militant and Labor Challenge of statements outlining the positions of the political committees of the Socialist Workers Party and the League for Socialist Action-Ligue Socialiste Ouvriere on the Sallustro kidnapping in Argentina.

Having considered the United Secretariat motion, the Political Committee of the LSA/LSO states the following:

(1) Re the assertion that the Militant and Labor Challenge statements are "public attacks" against another section: neither statement "attacked" the ERP-PRT. They criticized (by upholding the established Trotskyist position on terrorism) a serious error committed by the ERP-PRT. They differentiated the positions of the SWP and of the LSA/LSO from that of the ERP-PRT on the question involved - in our case a very important action in view of the FLQ events in Quebec in October of 1970.

(2) Re the claim that "these resolutions do not express any solidarity towards these comrades, at the moment when a fierce campaign is underway against them": We protest this outrageous assertion, one which is patently false and will be clear to all Trotskyists who are able to read our statement and that of the SWP. Both statements clearly attacked the Lanusse regime as being responsible for the violence in Argentina and solidarized with the victims of the repression. The LSA/LSO statement drew attention to the world-wide solidarity campaign now underway to defend the victims of the repression, a campaign in which we are considerably involved in Canada.

What can be the purpose of injecting such false accusations into the discussion of the ERP-PRT kidnapping, if not to prejudice the minds of members of the Fourth International against criticisms raised both by the SWP and ourselves.

(3) The LSA/LSO statement on the ERP-PRT kidnapping was not only rooted in the long-held, principled position of Trotskyism on terrorism, but attempted to convey to the Argentinian comrades and the world movement our recent experience with similar actions carried out by the Front de Liberation du Quebec in October of 1970.

We said: "The ERP action, like that of the FLQ supporters in Quebec, reduces the masses to the role of spectators. It avoids the necessary consistent work of bringing the masses into struggles around a program linked to their most urgent economic, social and political needs.

"Our recent experience in Quebec convinces us all the more that rather than involving the revolutionary forces in mass struggles, such actions separate the revolutionaryes from the masses, thus posing a block on the path to building a revolutionary party...."

We had every reason to expect that the United Secretariat would, at the first opportunity make a similar statement, particularly in view of the position adopted by the United Secretariat on the FLQ action in 1970. We quote:

> "While sympathizing with the nationalist and anti-capitalist sentiments of the FLQ, revolutionary socialists do not think that in the present context of Canada such actions are the correct means to bring about a mass struggle for an independent socialist Quebec."

Since the United Secretariat statement on the FLQ kidnappings in October 1970 nothing in the resolutions or declarations of the leading bodies of the Fourth International have sanctioned actions which substitute the actions of small, isolated groups for actions by the masses. None of the resolutions of the Ninth world congress do that either.

(4) We have put forward our position. The question which much of the world movement is now asking of the majority of the United Secretariat is: "What is the position of the leading body of the International?"

Instead of taking a clear position, instead of re-affirming the principled position of Trotskyism against adventurism, the majority of the United Secretariat evaded the question at the April 15 - 16 meeting. You neither approved nor disapproved the kidnapping and execution of Sallustro. You abstained from taking a stand. You voted down, 6 to 5, a motion to issue a public statement along the lines of the positions of the SWP and the LSA/LSO.

On top of its own indecision, the United Secretariat majority voted to disapprove the public statements of the LSA/LSO and the SWP. This can only lead the world movement to conclude that the United Secretariat majority approves the action of the ERP-PRT; and that, furthermore, it approves the public declarations in Rouge, La Gauche, and Red Mole which hail and approve the kidnapping.

(5) The decision of the United Secretariat majority to give specific instructions that the SWP and the LSA/LSO statements not be published in "the International's organs or in organs expressing its positions" only re-inforces our fears that a new line, an adventurist line departing from the traditions and program of Trotskyism, is being pushed in the movement. Was the ERP, in carrying out the kidnapping and execution of Sallustro, acting in accordance with the line of the majority of the United Secretariat? The conduct of the United Secretariat majority would indicate an affirmative answer to that question.

Those who disapprove of the ERP-PRT action must remain silent. Those who approve it are free to establish such an adventurist line throughout the world movement in their press. Meanwhile, the United Secretariat demurs.

In Canada we have already had a first hand experience with revolutionaries - certain members of the Young Socialists-Ligue des Jeunes Socialistes - who are convinced that the ERP-PRT action was an application of the line of the Ninth World Congress and of the majority of the United Secretariat. So convinced are they that such is the case, they decided to carry out a boycott of the issues of the section's press (Labor Challenge and Liberation) which carried the LSA/LSO statement on the kidnapping. These members of the Unified Minority Tendency of the YS/LJS

(who then constituted a majority of the Halifax and Fredericton locals of the YS-LJS) tried to justify their boycott out of "loyalty" to the line of thé International - the boycott being a public attack on the Canadian section, a violation of the relations established between the section and the YS-LJS and codified in their constitutions, and a violation of the democratic centralist norms of the YS-LJS.

In view of the above considerations, the Political Committee of the LSA/LSO finds completely unacceptable the April 15 - 16 resolution of the United Secretariat. We re-affirm our criticism of the ERP-PRT action within the framework of internationalist solidarity with its revolutionary fighters.

LSA/LSO Political Committee,
May 22, 1972.

SPEND YOUR VACATION IN THE BEAUTIFUL
ARE OF TYENDINAGA--where Camp Poundmaker
is situated

(Dated by R.D. - below)

Do what you want, when you want-
using the camp as your base.

A GREAT MANY POINTS OF INTEREST AND PLEASURE ARE WITHIN WALKING DISTANCE
A BICYCLE RIDE OR SHORT CAR JAUNTS

The camp area itself is approximately 25 acres, some of it cleared, parts of it heavily wooded, with rolling areas and rocky ridges,with secluded and open spaces. The favorite swimming area of the community is the Salmon River where it constitutes the north boundary of the camp. It is about four feet deep with gradual access making it suitable for children. About five miles up river is excellent swimming at a falls and cataract.

This year we will add a badminton court to the already establish baseball diamond. The lodge is spacious and well equipred for various forms of relaxation and entertainment should it rain.We have electric power

This year there is a permanent staff on location. It is the basic staff for the preparation and serving of breakfast and supper and it is ready to prepare sandwich lunches. It expects to recruit a volunary work crew to aid and clean up

The basic camp fee is $1 for unemployed and $2 for employed
Supper is $1.35. Breakfast and sandwich lunch 80 cents
The camp fee includes sleeping facilities but NOT bedding.

If you want to take a little time off to get into shape you are welcme to pitch in any of the projects that the staff has underway.Anyone is welcome to participate in the study class that the staff is conducting
or you can just sit around and relax, sleep, read, sunbathe
or you can hit the road,by foot, bike, or car.

South of the camp, some 20 miles, is one of the most beautiful areas in Ontario--Prince Edward County, jutting out into lake Ontario. Before you cross the Bay of Quinte you will pass the Maracle Mohawk Center on the Tyendinaga Reserve. Perhaps the most notable feature of the rolling,scenic, inlet-studded P.E. County is Outlet Park and Sandbanks Park. Many consider the swimming here the best anywhere in Ontario--there is a splendid sandy beach. The dunes at Sandbank Park are remarkable--a unique phenomena and well-worth seeing and climbing
North of the camp is one of the finest vacation areas in Ontario--many lakes, hotels, boating--diversions of all sorts. The area is wet. Anyone with a hot rod or motorcycle should not use the Kaladar Road-the temptation is too much
East of the camp--just a short car skip along is the city of Kingston. The four hour boat cruise that leaves there through the Thousand Islands is highly enjoyable. Kingston is the sight of one of the largest fortresses ever built in North America. It has been turned into an animated military museum . Along from Kingston is a 170 mile scenic strip The Seaway with 6,000 acres of parkland, including the Long Sault Parkway. Among its attractions is the Upper Canada Village which takes you back 100 years into the conditions of Ontario's past.

Come to Camp Poundmaker for a stay of any duration-to do what you want when you want. The camp phone number is 613-396-5386--all mail should go to 334 Queen Street West, Toronto--the phone numbers there are 3645908 or 3639618

31-5-'12

a revolt could only embarrass Moscow for it would immediately turn away the moderates who would assume that the only alternative to Spanish fascism was communist revolution; and the Russians weren't willing to support a revolution in Europe at this time." And another observation with regard to the political commissars in the International Brigades — that "the ideology they advocated was, however, not so much Marxist as liberal-social. Everyone knew that the commissars were expected to be party members, but the 'education' these men passed on was not hard-line Marxism so much as the moderate politics of the Spanish Republic. (Remember that the Comintern did not seek to provoke proletarian revolution in Spain at this time.)"

If he had come to grips with Beattie's evidence and that of Garner, Krehm and Van Passen, Hoar might have solved this monstrous contradiction in his book. And he might have besides rendered the service of providing all the essential facts and not just a partial and quite unbalanced record for what is yet to be written — the definitive history of Canadian participation in the Spanish civil war.

Jan. 5, 1972

In tribute to Henry Scott Beattie, veteran of the Mackenzie-Papineau Battalion

READ AND SUBSCRIBE TO

forward

Name_____

Address_____

$1 - 6 issues, $2 - 12 issues

Box 778, Adelaide St.P.O.

Toronto, Ontario

A FORWARD PUBLICATION

A suppressed page in Canadian history

CANADA & the CIVIL WAR in SPAIN

by Ross Dowson

Over the period of 1936-38, some 1,200 Canadians, in defiance of the Canadian government — Ottawa, passed a new Imperial Foreign Enlistment Act making their act a criminal offence — slipped out of the country for Spain.

On July 31, 1937, with all the appearance of neutrality, the same august neutrality that the King government observed in its refusal to sell arms both to the Spanish government and to the fascist insurgents who were being generously supplied by Hitler and Mussolini, Ottawa applied its Act to enlistment in either Franco's army, or in the Republican army.

On August 10, 1937, the government moved to halt the issuance of passports "except under definite restriction and guarantees." But the volunteers continued to slip out, even though now their passports bore the notation "Not Valid in Spain."

By various means they made their way to Paris and thence to the borders where, after evading French patrols under order of the Popular Front government headed by "socialist" Leon Blum, they were forced to scale the Pyrenees to get to their objective. Some attempted to complete their journey by boat, like the 20 who embarked from Marseilles on the Ciudad de Barcelona

June 8, 1972
Toronto

Halifax

Jacquie CH. Gary CP

Dear Art; CY

Enclosed you will find a Xerxx copy of the letters that immediately come to hand and mind on the transitional program and nationalization-compensation. I could not come across a copy of Should America Go Communist. I hope you have a copy in your library. It would be good to quote the master since these comrades do not seem to be very open to simple reason. If you dont have a copy let me know and I will obtain a copy to Xerox.

How are things going here. Well it would be best if Gary, Jacquie and John and Phil gave you their opinion. My impression is that they are having many difficulties but they appear to be coming along satisfactorily. Probably Jacquie is having the greatest difficulty. The challenge she responded to is the biggest regular one--editor of the paper. As you know we never had a reakx team--in reality Jacquie inher ited little from the past. Jacquie ~~xxxx

Where do I fit in., you ask. Well I am trying to be an advisor. Very difficult for me--particularly to be an advosor of a positive character. I absent myself from many things --for many years at our forums I felt that everything depended on me to carry our line, to respond to oppositionists--I felt that I was surrounded by silence Now that I dont go to many of them I take it that others are having to stand up and carry our line. At anyrate the forums are apparently going along fine. Not only do I not belong to the editorial board but I have refused to hand in my marked copies of Labor Challenge although they are sought after. Editor al meeting after editorial meeting I was the only person to have anything substantial to say--this was a great source of frustration not only for me--although I became sort of resigned to t--but to Dick. The meetings always seemd to be a Dick versus Ross affair--very bad. Of course when I pulled off--two meetings later the whole thing blew up and Dick resigned. That seems all in allnot to have been tood bad. And now a group of comrades--leaders in their own right are having to meet and discuss as leaders with responsibility.

It appears that the comrades thought that we would move Gary into the central office and that I would someway take a corner of it. I told them no and as soon as we moved Action Press with its darkroom upstairs in the conference room and I ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ and Jim had managed to move Crescent into Action---I packed up and took the dark room. Space is rather short but --now they can come to me when they want me . I dont intrude--but am available when they want me.

I am as busy as ever. I have spent about the last week on the camp. Even went out to it to talk to the comrades about the plans--paced out after locaitng the volley ball and badminton courts--got publicity out. In acouple of days the brochure will be out. This is a big project. The team out there is functioning well and the weekends have to come off . I promised Bryan that I would really tear into ~~xxx~~ his doctorate--- we made the deal so he would come into Cresent. Two chapters are now over due. I promised him one a month--but havent fou d the time. I plan to pick this up as soon as I clear away the LC article---and Now John Glenn wants me to work out wit th him the program of the Phillipine revolution. I have an appointment next Wednesday for a serio us discussion which he wants to tape. Phil was going to give the last class . this Sunday on the FI. He now feels that he cannot do it so I have agreed. t give this. Then I hope to take up the Belgians on the agrairian question, etc .etc.

I dont really know how the comrades read developments. I introduced Gary as the May Day speaker. Gary's epeach was a poor one--he had had no time to prpeare it it was long rambling with no real appeal. At the time I thought nothing particularly about it but Lois B intrepreted my few comments and the response of the comrades as a sort of swan song--and somehwat phrasical in the light of Gary's speech. But the she is a harsh critic. I took advantage of the trip to the SWP plenum to ~~xxxxxxx~~ tell Joe H and George N what was up here. Of course they littened but gave no words of advice or opinion. Probably Terry thinks that it is a clearing of the decks of the old factionalist

I am hoping that you will make an effort to write regularly to the operation here --articles to LC and information to Gary. It will be helpful to them. And of course I would be pleased to hear from you from time to time.

warmest regards

Ross

Some notes on the youth press--- by Kent---1 prior to June 10/72 that were submitted to a discussion

This is one of several contributions...

There has been talk for sometime on various levels of the movement, largely informal--on the need to re-evaluate the publ ication projects of Canadian Trotskyism. It has focussed on Young Socialist--sometimes touching on the theoretical journal. It has generally accepted the permanancy of Liberation and Labor Challenge. It takes the form of the need to fuze the Young Socialist with and Labor Challenge--or ~~the liquidation of~~ to liquidate the Young Socialist.

The latter formulation seems to me to be more accuate as usually there is no suggestion of making any real adjustments to Labor Challenge and after all we are publishing Young Socialist (to make it if it were possible to span the 2 tasks these papers have taken) on a paper specifically directed to the youth and have been doing so now for well over 10 years.

The framework of these notes is that we are in common agreement on the current youth radicalization and the need for an independent revolutionary socialist youth organization.

The Canadian movement has seen the independent revol utionary youth organization as ~~primarily~~ essentially a student organization--young workers more readily find their place in the LSA/LSO

The need for a youth press is felt on every level of the student population. Not only are there a great many university campus papers --both official and unofficial but there is a verit able flood of high school papers. Even though some of these papers are open to our participation--probably we havent taken advantage of them as we should--they are no substitute for a revolutionary socialist paper organizing radicalizing youth on a cross country basis on overriding issues in a democratic centralist movement and through the league part of the Fourth International

In fact they only prove the need for the Trotskyists to sustain a youth paper

On the campus arena we have found both the YS and the LC to be invaluaeble. The unviersity spans a wide age bracket and a wide level of interest and sophistication. Our last sub drive with its combination YS-LC offier showed that many radicals were interested on both pap rs. We know that our coming theoretical journal will have its greate st success on the campus showing that there is again even another interest level of ~~xxxxx~~ for us to develop.

With the student radicalization now penentrating down into the high schools it is hard to see how revolutionary socialist students can effectively express their views without a genuine youth paper that knows how to talk to high school students in terms of their own experiences. Our theoretical journal cannot meet that need and it is hard to see how Labor Challenge could do so.

Without a youth paper the attractivity and possibil ities of growth of the Young Socialists will be tremendously cutback. It will have no face of its own to present to the student youth. Its press above all is the demonstration of ~~ixmxm~~ the independence of the younth movement--from the older generation—including those revolutionary socialists who are only 5 or 6 years older then themselves

In fact our whole movement is faced with the challeng e to aid our youth even more than before to utilize more effecitvely its press. To take every possible advantage of a situation that may not long continue to exist---that neither the CP nor the NDP have a youth ~~xxxxx~~ press that comes out with any consistancy at all--and incendtly no youth organization.

The norm for an indepdnet youth organization is to have a press. The YS overall has been highly successful. What then are the arguments for giving up the Young Socialist ?

A good question. Our youth have utilized Labor Challenge. Did they find ~~that~~ in so doing did they find in life ~~there they found in life~~--in the circles that they used Labor Challenge ~~did~~--that YS was proven irrelevant. Not so. Did they ~~not~~ take Labor Challenge into the youth movement to the extent that we desired them to do so? Yes, ~~No~~ And if they had not ~~they~~ the League could very easily rectify that for interestingly enough the League has been growing faster and independently of the youth--in Toronto the league is considerably larger than the YS independtly of Comrades who hold league membership but whos e ~~league membership held by comrades whose~~ main area of activity is the youth

It is hard to belive that the effeci vity of Labor Challenge would be increased with the demisre of Young Socialist circulation wiase, from the point of view of political impact. So far we have found that the YS leads into Labor Challenge, that they supplement one another in certain levels of the youth radical ization. It would seem apparent that it would be more difficult if not almost impossible for Trotskyism to penetrate the high school radicalization without the Young Socialist.

~~x~~

No one has raised the question of the utilization of the material resoursesof the movement ~~x~~ in this discussion. We are all aware that the YS has not been a substantial financial drain--that it can tap resources outside of the area that ~~them~~ Labor Challenge ~~xxxx~~taps . The mere fact of the publication , and circulation of the YS is a substantial contribution to the League. It is a valueable traininig ground, a point of entry into the whole process of buidding Labor Challenge and the league. This big plus would be very difficult to transfer into LC and the league with the demisre of YS--this avenue would be closed.

Of course there are difficulties in puting out the YS --traininig, developing writers, administering it, selling it etc etc. There are also difficultires in putting out Labor Challenge, trai inig,developing wiriters, administering it, selling it. They xiix are all part of the challenge of building the revolutionary socialist vanguard and are not to be overcome except by diligently working at the task of building a team operation on both levels.

Perhaps the difficulties of puting out an effective youth paper are even felt to be greater than puting out LC. We do not have an effective guide readily available to consult. But the youth radicalization is so profound and what's more reaching down into the high schools that the publication of an effective youth paper is one of the supremen tests of the revolutionary vanguard .

Will the difficulties in puting out LC,building an effective circulation etc etc be in any way aided by the demisre of YS. While the League is pitifully samll it has good and sufficient forces to put out an effective press---The transfer of forces now involved in the youth press will make no meaning ful addition and wipe out what has been a valuaeable training ground.

It is clear that the liquiation of the YS would amount to a serious setback to our effecitvity, particularly in the area of youth radicualization and its most promising component the high schools.

One cannot help but feel that over the past period there has been a great deal of ciriticism of our press,both LS and YS by all the leading comrades. Perhaps it has been lacking in a necessary positivness and served to feed this negative proposition instead of leading to solutions.

June 27, 1972
Toronto

To the United Secretariat of the FI (Fourth International)

Dear comrades;

We have recently received a carbon copy of a letter from our Halifax comrade Will O. enclosing a carbon copy of an appeal to the United Secretariat signed by 3 Halifax members of the Unified Tendency of the Canadian section and 7 Y.S. tendency supporters.

The appeal asks that you establish a commission to "immediately investigate the internal democratic life of the section" and that you "prepare a report for the upcoming congress of the section". They further ask that you "examine the politics of the section as well as the democracy of its internal life," and they make this request as they say "fully cognizant of the fact that the commission may draw conclusions which we will not fully agree with".

Despite the expressed hope of those making the appeal, the political committee of the Canadian section in no way supports this appeal.

Without getting into the many points they raise, in order to assure you that everything is being handled within all the norms and democratic traditions of the Canadian section and the FI we would comment of a few.

Quite the contrary to point 2 all the documents but one of 6 received from the tendency have been published. This one document from comrade Bourhis is in the process of being translated into English. The other five are contained in Bulletin No 3 which you have received a copy of. As you will note from the cover it was delayed a few days from the June 1st formal opening of the discussion pending receipt of the June 12 letter from a comrade who is acting as their corresponding secretary. Since the five statements were circulated several months ago to all CC members Fredericton supporter Terry H-S withdrew from the tendency and we sought clarification on this and other matters in a letter to them dated June 6.

As you will note from our Political Committee minutes of June 7 which comrade Bourhis of the tendency received a copy of, contrary to point 5 a tour to permit the tendency to address all branches and locals is being arranged. A circular went out on June 20 to all branches and locals asking them for information so that the schedule of such a tour could be worked out that would be suitable to the tendency.

With regards to points 3 and 4. We do not understand how those making the appeal have concluded that "no time has been set aside at conventions for the discussion of appeals", as there has not yet been even a discussion on the agenda. Of course ample time will be allocated to this--we are confident that the convention will see to that. With regards to the appeal materials of the Halifax comrades against their suspensions which you will

COPY

recall were lifted last fall---in a letter addressed to them on June 20 we pointed out to them that the material they asked be published was of a truly massive scale, including among other items almost the entire transcript of the hearings which were hours long and much of which in our opinion are not too relevant to the appeal. We suggested that they make a selection from the 35 items or write up something of a specific appeal character--or do both. We are waiting to hear from them.

We are fully cognizant of the fact that because of the limited support that the tendency has been revealed to have in the section so far, and the widely dispersed character of this support, if the formal rules of representation were applied it would get little voice at the convention.

You will recall that at our last congress we took special measures to assure that the Montreal tendency of that time got a good hearing. You can be sure that we will make sure that similar arrangements will be made for this convention. Nothing will stand in the way of a full political discussion and resolution of the differences that exist in the Canadian section.

with revolutionary greetings

Ross Dowson
executive secretary of the
LSA/LSO

June 27, 1972
Toronto
334 Queen Street West

ISR

(Bklyn, New York)

Dear Comrades;

The previous issue of the magazine covering the USSR was an impressive achievement.

However there was one important area that you appear to have overlooked--the national question inside the USSR.

It would now seem apparent the struggle against Great Russian chauvinism will be one of the major components if not the major component in the developing political revolution.

Perhaps you were going to handle this question in some other way in a coming issue. You might consider coming to grips with it by reviewing Internationalism or Russification by Ivan Dzyuba and/or the book Ferment in the Ukraine --a Preager Publication an important book I gather

comradely

Ross Dowson

July 3, 1972

New Zealand

Dear Keith; (Locke)

It was good to get your note, to have been reading over the past short period of your excellent and very bold campaign -Socialists for Labor, and to hear of Russell's return. Glad to see that he is shaking things up--but in an organized way.. It is always good to hear from New Zealand which the fates seems to be casting in an increasingly xxxx important role in the world movement.

Yes ,it is unbelievable that the majority (US-FI) leadership is staking its reputation on the ERP as it did on Bolivia--all the more unbelievable in the light of the Bolivian debacle. And now too it has the IMG. I can hardly wait to read what Mandel will xxxxxx say about the political resolution and what they call its main line. Pat Jordan has put them on the spot. Perhaps you know that he stepped down from secretary and any other similar post. The sharpest operator in the IMG leadership, John Ross, characterized the debate at their recent congress as "redefining the terms," breaking with the past,' ---well Pat is about the last link with what xxxx the IMG has with past English Trotskyism.. In a speech he referred to the tendency of the document to break with the methodology of the FI--on some questions already apparent--on the formulations on the transitional program. He said that he considers the theoretical errors of the main line of the document to be so dangerous that I would oppose them even if I were a minority of one. He said that he was convinced that he was wrong in not resigning when the NC passed the document and in not writing a counter document. In answering a chaleenge that he should have set up a tendency he said---"They argue that we dont have a position--we do. We xxx have the first three congresses of the IIIrd International and those of the IV. We have the transitional program. Where do they stand on these documents. They're breaking from these documents."

The congress showed what a mulligan stew the IMG is. It would appear that the NC is split on Ireland. At anyrate --imagine--the congress had no document on Ireland for discussion or vote. On Women's liberation--the majority position which included maintaining Socialist Women Groups carried --59 for, 22 against, 47 abstaining. Their industrial work has been a fiasco. At the last congress this was the big turn that Pennington-Ross projected. This spring xxxxxx the comrade allocated to head up this work submitted a report to their NC--- Thier leaflet for the miners was so out of it--he reported that he almost got beat up by the miners at Nottinhlam, It appears that he had never had any previous experience in this area and got no help whatsoever from the leadership in this work. Last but not least to all effects and purposes the leadership suppressed the United Secretariat's fact finding report.

The tendency's doucments are very good and I gather that they all conducted themselves well--Connie has been doing a remarkable job. I havent written them yet as I only recently received the documents to scan over. Both John and Naomi attended. Pat mentioned, Pat Jordan--that one or two leading members of the Fourth International had some similar criticisms of the NC perspectives document. Of course we cannot anticipate much from Ernest--after all he has been a big promoter of this IMG gang--and the worst tendencies are going to be reinforced with the recruitment of Blackburn and the New Left Review operation. As for the Ligue Communiste, while they have less of a vested interest they dont from what I know so far appear to be learning much from all this.

Here in Canada we are xxx swinging into the convention preoparations. By now you will have received four bulletins--and the note on the withdrawal of the Quebec No 1 document. I have been trying to pull back and force other leading comrades to move in andtake responsibility That document slipped out without me reading it. There were two big errors in it aside from it not having an explanatory note as to what it actually is. It is a program for the national liberation of Quebec, xxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxx xx Lastxxxxxxxxx convention we adopted a statementexplaining why socialist identify with the national struggle This year we decided we wanted a popular statement that we could circulate very widely to separatists just what the tasks are to establish an independent and French quebec. It is a program for the socialist revolution within the framwork of the Quebec independentist mood. The document still held to the concept of a labor party development--but it is apparent to me that the whole next stage of the political development in Quebec is going to be through the Parti Quebecois--which came out of the recent working class upsurge tremendously strengthened. Along with this the approach of the document towards the independentist masses who are moving to the PQ was lifeless and formalistic, you might even say dogmatic with its quotes from Trotsky--it had to be on the basis of expwriences in Quebec with the Quebec PQ. Phil and I went to Quebec and worked out all the required changes in agreement with the Quebec bureau and we will have the new version out this week. Somewhat embarassing for the comrades but it better to have a correct document. I was going to prepare the political resolution but then proposed that the other comrades do this --so it is taking a little longer. We are going through a big experience with the political committee

Here in Canada we are xxx swinging into the convention preoparations. By now you will have received four bulletins--and the note on the withdrawal of the Quebec No 1 document. I have been trying to pull back and force other leading comrades to move in andtake responsibility That document slipped out without me reading it. There were two big errors in it aside from it not having an explanatory note as to what it actually is. It is a program for the national liberation of Quebec, xxxxxxx xxxxxxxxxx xx Lastxxxxxxxxx convention we adopted a statementexplaining why socialist identify with the national struggle This year we decided we wanted a popular statement that we could circulate very widely to separatists just what the tasks are to establish an independent and French quebec. It is a program for the socialist revolution within the framwork of the Quebec independentist mood. The document still held to the concept of a labor party development--but it is apparent to me that the whole next stage of the political development in Quebec is going to be through the Parti Quebecois--which came out of the recent working class upsurge tremendously strengthened. Along with this the approach of the document towards the independentist masses who are moving to the PQ was lifeless and formalistic, you might even say dogmatic with its quotes from Trotsky--it had to be on the basis of expwriences in Quebec with the Quebec PQ. Phil and I went to Quebec and worked out all the required changes in agreement with the Quebec bureau and we will have the new version out this week. Somewhat embarassing for the comrades but it better to have a correct document. I was going to prepare the political resolution but then proposed that the other comrades do this --so it is taking a little longer. We are going through a big experience with the political committee

Big changes here all around. Joan N has now gone on to be organizer in Vancouver--we brought Gary into the central operation. Bev B has gone into Winnipeg. Wendy has been switched to Vancouver from Edmonton at lastwith two leading Vancouver youth going into Edmonton. We have had big grwoth in Edmonton. Joe Y has come East to Ottawa-Hull. We needed an initator like Joe there and besides his French is very good and hw will be a help to our relatively new operation in nearby Hull and will be in close and constant contact with Montreal--about 4 hours away. The Mill tendency is pretty well out of the movement in Montreal--they just dont have any prespective inside our movement and it has been hrd for them to keep their people in the movement. They wouldn't be in our movement if it weren't for the situation in the International. There are many more of them outside of the movement with a continuing relationship of sorts with one another than inside the movement. They have picked up a few disgruntled elements here and there across the movement but they have recently lost their connectio s with Fredericton--teir leading person there has pulled away from them --because he said they have in fact a split perspevtive.

Of course the right wing NDP attack on Waffle is the big issue these dyas. The Orillia Provincial council meeting 's attack on Waffle was extremely sharp--in effect Lewis placed his resignation on the table and this accounts for the failure of the pro-Waffle elements to win the support there among the delegates that I predicted in my article in the June(late) LC. Perhaps you were wondering who the ultra-lefts were that I indirectly attacked in that article. Some belong to a small circle around the U of T who consider themselves Trotskyists but European Trots--they real the Red Mole. A couple of them have been coming around our forum. They disagree with us on the language struggle--on the national struggle in Quebec. With the rise of the union struggle there were all so happy--they think that the national struggle is something low level, primitive, ignorant,to be bypassed once the workers move out in class battles--instead of it being the envelope within whichthe class struggle develops in Quebec. Last weekend was Jean Baptise Day and Quebec Presse run by the unions was full of ads --for a French Quebec. Of course we moved into the struggles with our press and leaflets--we have only a few unionists and they played a good role in their milieu but without yet any real roots in the working class milieu we were unable to play any real role in the process. We came out of it all much better than any other left current. The NDP is more and more out of the Quebec scene with its federalism. The CP is also federaliste. This month some of the comrades are going trailblazing though Quebec with Liberation.

Hard to say where the Waffle struggle is going. The Wafle left Orrillia after a big rally where the leadership pledged itsself to struggle--good words. But there are rumours going the rounds that some elements are now for structuring it outside the party. Unfortunately Waffle has not been integrated in the constituency clubs although it has a better chance than ever--and it is very heterogeneous in composition. If any sizeable number tried to structure Waffle outside of the NDP it would have very bad impact on the Waffle as a whole. Unfortunately the radicalization isn't yet such as to permit us to hope to win anysizeable number to Trotskyism. We move very boldy in and around all the meetings with our press. I am astonished that there has been really no redbaiting. Someone attacked Charlie Lee at the Brillia Waffle meeting as a Trot and got howled off the floor. Waffle plans to hold a conference in August to discuss its course. The leadership of the NDP seem determined to outlaw them no matter the cost...affirming the British experience that right wing SD's will never let left wing formations take over the party, they will splat them first

But to comment on a few points you raise in your letter. I do not think that it is too important that the comrades have not been very active in the party when they come to defend themselves. After all eve if they had only a membership and attended a few meetings they would by that toen have been more active than about 90% of the m members. Our experience is that there is a good healthy feeling ~~in~~ among workers for democracy in the party. We have had a big experience in defeniding ourselves. Dont you have copies of a couple of defense pamphlets we put out? Just in case you dont I will send them under separate cover. The comrades shouldn't be backward in raising hell--if only for fear ~~that~~ and discomfit that it causes the right wing. We were able to make the expulsions very very costly for the RW--we always came out of the struggle, even though we lost them all formally with more comrades inside the labor party than we had when the withch hunt commenced. Besides they were a first rate experience for the comrades politically. I would say that they trained a whole layer of our cadre politically--made them Trotskyists. When you get the pamholets you will see that the comrades directly involved are now the key cadre of the Canadian section. Do you have the boud volumes of Labor Challenge and Va guard ---we covered these events very fully in our press.

A short while ago I proposed that we should seriously consider more openly and persistantly idenitfyi g the LSA-LSO with the FI. As you know the NDP is affiliatedd to the Second International---and we have always felt that this question tended to affirm our existence as a n opposition party. I have been thinking from the i terests of our tendency in the FI it would be valuable--the south ~~~~.

[illegible] has displayed opportunist tendenceis, largely in the area of ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ maneuverism. I would say that the big maneuver he is now involved in has some big possibilites , dangers of course, but so far it seems to me to be good. He is moving in on this corpse of a party which is now on the ballot in order to come up and out of the underground--which strikes me as brilliant. He has probably got the third largest section in the FI right now. At the 9th WC he came over and told me that there are three Trotskyist parties in the FI---us, the south and his. He is making important connections acrsoss Latin America. Those who are always barking at his heels are ~~xxxxxxxx~~ sectarians- what truth there is in their charge that he has opportunist tendencies dont make him worse than they---as I understand it opportuism is only the other side of coin--sectarianism.

No I am not going to Europe in the forseeable future. John with his linguistic gifts ~~xxxx~~ and his youth can play a more effective role than I. It will be a big experience indeed to be working with such top flite comrades as Mary-Alcie and Jack ---just the type of experience that John needs. All I intend to do is pull back from the day to day decisions and work of the movement--to write. I made a deal with a comrade if he would come in on Crescent that I would write his doctorate. He picked a topic of interest to us and which the university may publish as a pamphlet when it is done. The Revivial of the Marxist Left. I wrote his final paper on the Struggle for a Spcialist NDP. Alas if only got a B--we will be using this somehow shortly. Unfortunatlry I got carried away and wnet over twice the required length.. I want to ork on our archives--and write some hisroty of the movement--you saw my little peice on Canada and the Spanish Civil war. So far what with the convention preparations I havent been able to do anything I planned. I havent even really started on the thesis and about half of it is already due. Of course I belong to our East branch--tonight I was out doing sub work -- a sort of example. John is back from the Philippinrs and I am going to try to help him give adivse to the comrades there. I am trying to get a feel of that area

Interested in your comments on Australia

A holiday! I doubt it.. Rading--I started 1905 by LT--positivly brilliant-- a tremendous affirmation of the Marxist method--of the lwfulness of the historic process as George Novak points out in his review. I am right now going through Millibands book on Parliamentary Socialism--a study of the LP--really good --but I find little time. You must get a copy of this latter book. I see he has a new book coming out on Parliament and the State which should be valuable to all of us who live in countries where there is a labor party

The objective conditions for holidays are riper than ever before. Our camp is flourishing this year for the first time. Last week we had 95 people out to it bedded them fed them over Saturday, Sunday and Monday. It was a big success.

But I must close off--- Three documents--womens Liberation, Political resolution and the new version Quebec will be ready for me tommorrow along with other things.

warmest regards

Ross

July 5, 1972

New York

Dear Bryan

I am now working on the thesis again. I got pulled away by some important problems we are having here. As you will now knew we have pulled back the Quebec document. I had not seen it before it was put on stencils and when I did read it is was apparent to me that it was wrong on two very serious counts---which the comrades agree on now---it was not correct in the document to raise the labor party issue---the PQ is going to be the reformist experience of the working class in the whole next period--and the PQ was dealt with in a formalistic, even dogmatic way whereas we have to deal with it on the basis of the experiences that the masses are going to be going through. We are also having problems with the political resolution. As you probably know I pressed the comrades that they should write it --not I. Well it is taking twice three times the labor--but I think that it is necessary.

I turned your contribution over to the bulletin and as you will see it is now out. The discussion in our branch hasn't got to this plane--We had one on Quebec, another on the Gay document. This is a big question that has been in discussion in the leadership. You have had the first public word. It is even more complicate than you think and that is why I just turned your contribution over. Incidently I hear that the south there is concernxd about the lack of separate identity of the YSA from the SWP and they are thinking again in terms of a YSA publication. of some sort.

As you have probably heard we had a big weekend at the camp whch has been transformed by the work team out there. They bedded and fed some 95 people over ~~xmxkxx~~, Sat and Sunday and Monday. I didn't go but stayed to work on the thesis and other accumulte material.

The thesis has an even higher priority than Labor Challenge--you will be hearing from me--pardon the shortness of this not but I must get to work.

as always

Ross

Notes which I gave to Gary (P.) & out of which came his July 11/72 Memorandum
(from the central office of the LSA, Toronto; transcribed from RD's handwriting –ed.)

Our decision to accept the term (Canadian) nationalist is based on the Canadian experience both on the particular feature of US capitalism's relations with the (Canadian) ruling class and on the response of the (Canadian) radicalization.

US capital investment has become a big factor in the economy of a number of advanced capitalist countries. **But it truly plays a unique role in Canada.**

GM *(General Motors)* as we noted hires 25,000 Canadian employees and as a corporate entity is about a third of the size of the entire Canadian economy. US capital investment in Canada is greater than its entire Latin American investment – more key industries in Canada are under foreign control (predominantly American) than in any other developed country in the world.

On top of that unlike other advanced capitalist countries Canada's population is concentrated in a thin strip across the US northern border across which floods TV, radio programs, books, magazines of the most violent racist & huckster character which have had a big impact on the thinking of the Canadian youth & the working class as a whole.

In our epoch above all the revolutionary socialists, the Marxists, must be sensitive to the new aspects of national consciousness that are developing across the globe & of which Canadian nationalism is an example.

Supplementary material contained in the pamphlet of that name in fact challenged the NDP to meet this sentiment that was developing in the youth milieu and finding expression on NL *(new left)* circles.

(The following from notes – ed.)
I think we should quote further -- page 9 of document – Far from promoting this nationalism -- This brand of nationalism – that was Waffle's **fundamental character** – as if to prove our contention this Canadian nationalism went to the NDP willy nilly. Not only did it go to the NDP but in a very short space of time became the nucleus around which a broad left wing characterizing itself as socialist developed. The Waffle has been the main area of our NDP work.

-- the most massive protest in the entire youth radicalization was in response to Nixon's going ahead with the nuclear bomb test off the Canadian Pacific coast at Amchitka. This protest was not an anti war protest but was anti US imperialist anti Nixon and pollution and pro Canadian. Many of these youth carried the Canadian flag and sang "O Canada" in protest. Our tendency of all the left was the only one to intervene – in fact in some areas we led the action and took it forward into an anti-Vietnam war direction.

July 12, 1972

Vancouver

Dear Dick (Purscep?)

I received your letter this morning--just as I was going to reply to your previous note--I see dated Vancouver May 1. That letter came in just around the time that Gary was moving into the situation here. As you probably know I am trying to move backfrom the day to day decisions of the movement so I can do some serious writing and also to press the younger comrades forward into taking some of the real responsibilities of the movement.

When Gary moved in as organizational secretary I handed him the file of various recent letters and yours got sorted into the answered file instead of the to-be-answered. Last Sunday I was going through my library and noted a box of books that I have up on a top shelf that belong to you. It suddenly struck me that I had not answred your letter and Gary had said nothing to me about his answering it so I gathered it had not been answrred. I found that to be the fact on Monday when he hauled it out for me.

I have no objection whatsoever to your puting the mortgage in my name. and would be entirely agreeable to handling the monthly payment as you suggest. I have a will that does not detail properties but gives the executors full powers of disposal--you know the executors. I wouldn't bother Alan G---why dont you ask our lawyer friend Macy out there and go right ahwad if you wish. I do not consider it unweildy for me or particularly risky. I leave it in your hands to make the investigation from Macey and if you are satisfied to go right ahead.

I live at 27 Bulwer Street Toronto 133
other

Now as to your ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxxx~~ proposition.--in your letter of this morning. I must say that it caught me off guard so to speak. That money has moved places, In fact to be frank with you I have no memory at all that it was in the form of what you call a grant. You will recall we purchased the lot at Pigeon Lake with its 3 acres ---then Jim Howell gave us gratis about 8 acres at the present site of Camp Poundmaker. So I sold Hugh D the Pigeon Lake lot and used it to purchase three construction sheds plus other lumber to build the lodge at Poundmaker. Then Jim had to sell the rest of the lot and this would have in effect boxed us in with our 8 acres so I told him we would match any offer he got for the other 17 or so acres. ~~xxxxxxxxxxxxx

Perhaps you would like to consider doing that. It is ten miles from Napanee on the Montreal Toronto CN line. Snow country, the lot if very beautiful. You could fix up something in the lodge and live very cheaply. It would be a somewhat secluded life but ideal for anyone who has some projects in mind.

As I say I do not remember the 2,000 being a grant--a loan of indefinite dura tion. I thought that it was a donation --a really splendid one of course. But you know my personal attitude towards money and the future. I see money as useful only to the revolution. a loan of indefinte duration ~~would~~ I would tend to look upon as a donation in my own mind's eye---not intending by that, to ignore the generosity of it being a loan. How can I tell you that our operation is unable to give it back to you on some $50 a month basis. It would tax us a bit but by no means bankrupt us. So if you wish to proceed on this matter this way let me know via return mail.

A few words of a personal character which you should ignore if you think them to be presumptuous on my part and none of my business at all. I do not see why you should be so concerned about money. I live a good life on $55 a week--my only regret is that I have no time to do many of the things that I would like. The future! Well I never ~~guessed~~ any of my plans with the imminent success of the revolution. To be honest with you I never thought that I would live so long--here I am now 55 years this September. Aren't I due for old age pension in about 5 or 10 years. From the sheer economcis of existence I guess I have just about made it . If I lost this cushy15 hour a day 6-7 day a week job somehow I figure that I could pick up $55 a week ~~somewhere~~ since most jobs are paying double that a week for less than half the hours. You of all the persons I know are the one who has a secure and regular income hell or high water. And yet stange to say you appear to be more worried about these problems than anyone I know. I have always thought that as a revolutionist I was prepared to go through whatever my class goes through...to live in a single room if necessary and put up with what hundreds of thousands of my class put up with--well not put up with for I would expect that I would have the energy to organize and fight for those of my class in my condition. I know that is all pretty much of an abstration As I think that there are persons who would see to it that I would not slip into that situation if I couldn't help it. But that is how I have seen it. But it seems to me that you of all persons I know have more than enough to live upon.

I think that you should be living it up on that guaranteed income of yours and stop worrying. And if you want to go ahead with that mortgage deal and if you feel it necessary affirm to me your desire about that grant-donation , and if it interests you-take up the proposition of living with nature the next fall-winter-spring at camp Poundmaker...rent free-- let me know.

As I said earlier I thought I would be pulling back but I am busier than ever- This convention is going to be heavily documented and while I have pushed other comrades into writing them I am having to go over what in many ways are first efforts. Coral has gone off for a couple of trips to hit campus bookstore purchasers so I am doing more than my one day a week stop over in the store. ..which is perking up with the excellent angency material of Crescent. Aside from Quebec--BC seems to be the Canadian hot spot these days. I see the bosses are taking it easy with the IWA and their government agents preparing to move further against the construction Workers.

Right now we are involved in the big disupute in the Waffle. Watkins and Laxer are running before the Lewis gang in the direction of setting up Committees for an Indpenedent and Socialist Canada outside of the NDP. We are going to take them to the wall and will probably end up with a Left caucus in the NDP, broader than before but without the prestige of Laxer and Watkins. A very valuaeble experience ahead for our NDP fraction. But I see I am coming to the end of this page and still a little time left to work on a job that I told Brian I would do for him and despite his urgings am moving all too slwly on.

comradely greetings

Ross Dowson

July 13, 1972
334 Queen Street West
Toronto

George Novack (SWP)
New York

Dear George

I have just finished reading your article In Defense of Materialism. It is an excellent contribution to the international debate and the Canadian, which will soon be the focal point of it all.

Of course our subjectivists -idealists do not stop with Lucaks but have a strong affinity for Gramsci. Some little while back I recall seeing a review of something about or by Gramsci in the Militant. Its line suprised me as I have been of the opinion that he considered as one of Lenin's merits what he might call his freedom from idology and was critical(carefully) of Marx for the stress he gave to material over ideological forces. An article I read some time ago in Studies on the Left suggested that Gramsci advanced the theory of socialism in one country before the Russians and was a proponent of Popular Frontism before it became the official comintern policy.

Perhaps there may be a suitable ocassion for you to take up Gramsci in the next period and still further the education of our comrades who certainly are under strong pressure of the New Left. We seem to be in this about 6 or 7 years behind the peak of the rage

warmest regards

Ross

July 18, 1972

Letter to Colleen *(L., Montreal?)* *(italics: added or notes)*

Alain *(B.)* brought in your letter re the minority defection. It came first as we were preparing a statement for the info of the movement. It could brook no delay as the gossip was spreading. After hearing your letter we called what was as close as we could get *(to)* a bureau meeting and the letter was read and discussed.

None of the comrades agreed with you but in the process of the discussion some matters were clarified.

For instance Alain said the split was ‘’necessary’’ and justified. I told him I did not know what he meant – the split is a fact. They justify their action. I expressed my surprise at the action, but also said *(illegible)*

But the reality is that I was pleased.

In attempting to comprehend your view I suggested that perhaps you are seeing the whole thing from the point of view of the international dispute and their splitting on the edge of the convention *(which)* of course blocks this discussion which is to go on willy-nilly, from a full development and settlement in the Canadian section. The matter is not settled by their action. Only in part you might say – again – that is all outside of our control now.

There is an aspect of the matter that perhaps you overlooked however. What we have had is a disloyal tendency that no matter *(what)* our efforts, made it very difficult if not impossible to have a rational discussion on the questions and dispute. In that they are a disloyal tendency (have sabotaged the work of the movement at every turn) I am not at all sorry that they have left. They weren`t in any way taking us into an honest discussion of the differences. In fact *(they)* were so poisoning the atmosphere that they were actually a block to anyone coming seriously to grips with the differences – that they are only carrying into the Canadian section.

We want to react coolly – but also to defend the movement.

Their action is a crime against the movement. Those who are in the leadership have to make that known – and draw a sharp line between the movement and them. We can give nothing to any concept that you can play around with this matter, that the unity of the movement is not important. All the more hat they were the nucleus of a tendency which has formed connections elsewhere. We have to tell those persons what we think of persons who split from the movement – all the more in that we are on the verge of a convention in the preparation of which we took a whole series of actions in violation of our norms in order to do everything possible to get at the politics.

I do not recall if you have seen their statement or whether you are aware of a talk that Art *(Y)* had with Terry H-S. Everything points to this having all been worked out so that they can confront us and the international with the question of establishing a situation in Quebec where there would *(be)* the LSO/LSA – the official section -- and they a sympathizing section. This would be a totally unacceptable situation for us. To end *(all)* possible illusions about such a thing we must in my opinion sharply separate ourselves from them.

We are not dealing with revolutionists – Trotskyists – who have a difference with us that the whole movement would benefit from their having a chance to experience in carrying their line in action. They are an unprincipled alliance of elements who have never really carried the line of the majority of the Canadian movement. Trotskyism even if you could stretch it to encompass them, never has and isn`t going to learn from them anything of a positive character. They are now a source of confusion in the Quebec Left for us. If they have the energy and they probably do – they will have a paper. They will probably appear shortly with a number of the X-s and other opponents of orthodox Trotskyism.

We are going to have to mark ourselves out from them – demark ourselves from them. Any appeal for unity is incomprehensible and shortly (…*text ends)*

Comradely *(signed off in Ross Dowson`s handwriting)*

July 19, 1972
Toronto

Sudbury

Dear Ken; (-?)

I have taken the liberty of sending you off in the mail 2 copies of the paperbacks Labor's Giant Step and Teamster Rebellion. I figure they will be welcomed by such guys as John V. They are reasonably priced. I am not sure how you function but they might provide the basis for a nice discussion over a case of beer with a bunch of them.

My impression of John V was very good. I think we can depend on your judgement as to whether he should be invited to the convention. By now you have learned of the desertion of the Mill tendency in Montreal. It is probably part of a maneuver to confront us with an organized operation there which will present itself for recognition as a sympathizing group. The rest of the tendency of course will carry on from the inside. So the convention will by no means be a normal one. There will be big representation from overseas --the focus of the international dsipute will be Waterloo. So it will be somewhat confusing for a guest. We will of course try not to let the internal dispute dominate the convention. I think that the political resolution and the women's liberation documents are very good so far. You are an experienced revolutionist and you know these people. I think that the letter authorizing branch organizers to use their judgement should apply to you.

comradely

Ross

July 28, 1972
Toronto

Halifax
Dear Art and Penny;

Is it not strange that Halifax has never ever responded in anyway to the subscription drive(Fredericton uppped their quota twice) Was never anything said about the drive by LSAers or in the YS local!

Another peculair incident. Between Monday noon and Tuesday nite the entire group of Maritimes & Quebec subscribers, the plates and the plastic box they a are kept in dissappeared from the mailing room. Regula was here over that period and she says that the room was locked and all the plates again locked up in a cabinet except for a period possibly of ten minutes on Monday. The number of plates of course is very small. Walter was in on Monday and Clerridge was haging ar und.

This would suggest that the Mill split is to widen at the convention and they are getting ready. Nothing has happened since the big Waterloo break-in to give us any insight into who did it. That time we lost the entire Toronto membership, readership and contact list. Are we about to see something happen that will give us some insight into that affair.

Of course we are not saying anything --but it would be good for you to keep your ears and eyes open

comradely

Ross

July 31, 1975

D

Vic Hugh Bob Mc

Dear Gord;

ly attended

I suppose you heard that the modest trade union weekend proved useful. The attendance was small and the operation attempted to establish its authority over it. Both Vern and Brain came out all prepared to give leadership with a couple of talks. Both talks were completely out of touch with what the really involved unionists wanted to talk about and fell by the wayside. McCarthy and Jane came. Bob's participation in the informal discussion first day was quite bad, patty factionalism--but his contribution in the second session which Vern tried to lead was very good. It was apparent that there were many important matters -particularly practical problems of working in the union movement that needed to be discussed.

I gathered from some comments by Vern that the operation had concluded that we did not want general gatherings of our trade union activists but that a select committee was intending to establish its authority calling in comrades from time to time to get a report from them and line out their actions in the next period. Vern named the committee--its personnel. It was absurd--not one of the activists at this gathering is on it and only two of the committee-Vern and Brian came here. The committee was transparently irrelevant. Vern openly conceded that there was a need for general meetings of the trade unionists and that the problem had probably been that ~~[illegible]~~ matter heretofore they had not worked out useful topcis and known how to conduct the discussions.

The gathering and my discussion with Cliff on the way down to the camp had a big impact on him. He had carried the line on Canadian nationalism but admitted to me that he now realised that he did not understand what the discussion had been all about. He was quite embarassed when I kidded him about his attack on Hugh ~~[illegible]~~ being petty bourgeois in a branch meeting a while back. At the end of the discussions he went down to see Vic H about getting into Goodyear--he has a serious long range outlook to our trade union work.

Jane came up to the cabin here a couple of times to talk things over. It is hard to get things out of her but she thinks that the Canadian Womens Coalition has become a comfortable little spot for some of our comrades and I would gather thinks that we should take the seats that Pelrine and Morgenthaler have left open to us in CARRAL. We had an informal little talk about our NDP line but I am not sure what she understands

John D dropped in --his usual enthusiastic self but he didn't even stop to have a talk. He came and went on his way to Montreal to pick up his and John R's furniture I would gather that he is going to stay in Toronto for sometime. John's level of activity in the movement is subject to incredible variation. For periods he is super active. Up until recently he was the key activist in Montreal--running the bookstore typing up all the copy for Liberation and doing the layout. It is possible that he is in one of his slumps. But it would be very valuable to have some discusions with him right now about the situation in Montreal and problems of Quebec nationalism. There have been some big problems but I am not privy to them. For several months prior to the convention John R, Phil and Art were spending weeks after week there. These problems were never discussed on the PC. The changes--the dropping of the action program, the withdrawls and replacement of the whole first part of the document on Quebec were never seriously motivated and of course not written up. So the movement missed a big educational experience which it will probably pay for later. Yes, it would be good to have some talks with John D on Quebec.

Many interesting things in your letter. I dont know what pressure Lynda is under from the leadership to lead. I Lynda herself wants to be a leader. But in the minds of the rest of the comrades-particularly the women comrades I would imagine Lynda has little credibility--particularly after she withdrew twodocuments at very important pa ts of debate . I think her reversal on Canadian nationalism which she is no doubt making known will also do little to heighten their respect for her. This question was by no means resolved in the minds of many comrades by the convention and I would think that life has continued to unresolve it. Hansen's attempt at the convention to replace the concept of a new nationalism with the concept of populism (a populism that is expressed not on a regional basis but between two nations) which seems quite novel to me) didn't strengthen the opposition to our view.

I have just recently studied the last two issues of LC. Dennis has an article in Number 82-Break from the Cold War Policy in which he has Canada as a "partner in U.S. genocide"

It was good that Regula attended the gathering. I think that her concept of super-activism as being the problem reflects her own problem more than the general. As you know I really put the heat on her to go on staff ,which she did finally only to pull out later. It was she who presented to me a super activist concept of organizer. She carried the line that she could not have a personal life with Nick and be organizer, or have a child etc etc which I fought against. That was one of our many setbacks in developing a new and collective leadership. And Regula unlike some others was a leader in her own right. I see Zane puts go go activism without thinking as a produc of events since 1970 which I think is correct---that breakdown of the cadre prior to Waterloo when I was in Europe.

Claire's views are extremely interesting. My impression is that Claire learned more in the dispute than anyone of us. It is too bad that she is not a consistant materialist. ---but what a dialectician !

I have not yet had a chance to read Barne's document that you refer to--and I am not at all clear just what role the new Canadian nationalism will ply in the pre-congress discussion. As you know even tho a member of the IEC I did not sign the Leninist-Trotskyist tendency appeal. By doing so would have required the LT tendency to take a position on this question. Is Barnes' document going to be adopted by the LT tendency as a tendency document ? Of course we should say what we have to say in the LSA/LSO discussion but I cannot see how a debate on this question would serve the purpose of firming up the LT tendency. Incidently I have written the CO that I am not going to the LT tendency gatehering after Oberlin. John R suggests that my presence would strengthen the Cdn delegation however I do not see it--my difference on Cdn nationalism and now the document that I drew up with the agreement of the leadership back in 1970 on our strategic orientation to the NDP. That 1970 document was Canada's contribution to the discussion on entrism. Dick dismissed it as my view(critical but unconditional support of the NDP) xxx Now the paper has dumped this view--so in effect they have dumped our 1970 contribution to the world discussion --which I think is right on.

I think that I told you after my last visit to Toronto and my discussion with John and Phil that I challenged them to openly take on the 1970 document instead of dumping in peicemeal in the pages of the public press. It would be good if they would do so as it would change the whole axis of the debate in the movement.

This leadership's dumping of our previous positions was hidden by the necessity of our having to take the line of Canada-US relations foward in the light of the new nationalism---but that has been the chief phenomena--their dumping of our previously held positions. (their new and ultra left line of womens liberation--their attempts to make abortion law repels what they call explicitly feminist, their dumping of our analysis of the Quebec union leadership and their concept of Quebec as a colony whose liberation can only be won by the insurrection, their revision of our stategic concept of the NDP etc--including many other things like their concept of cadre

This was also hidden by the need to come to grips with the leadership problem--their at long last expressed intention to rally to the challenge and my desire that they do so and unwillingness to appear to stand in anyway in the way. That of course was the overiding question that prevented us as a collective from having the comradely and educational discussion that was really necessary to come to grips with this new phenomena Canadian nationalism. They fellinto the trap of using this to establish that there was now finally arrived a new leadership--but one that had to break from the past, instead of being a continuity.

When I next come in we should discuss this idea of Wayne's that we have discussions amongst ourselves within the next several weeks. Right after Oberlin we should raise the matter of reopening the debate on nationalism--it would then seem quite logical that we should meet. Otherwise our coming to ether should have the utmost appearance of informality and casualness. I am sure that the unease in the movement has by no means lessened but has probably increased.

Lots more to say but if I close off now I will just manage to get this into the mail box for pick up. The postman comes anytime within the next half hour.

Warmest regards

Ross

334 Queen Street West
Toronto 133, Canada
August 8, 1972

Dear Murray and Jeanette

I received your note of June 4 with regards to several matters including the lot at Poundmaker . I did not do anything as I assumed that you would be able to drop in sometime durimg your holiday around that area. And now I have your note of July 30.....and Ruth's phone call today about her trip visit to Iroqois Falls and St. James Bay.

It is too bad, in respect to the Poundmaker lot that you are settling in at Iriquois Falls. I was out there last weekend and the place is becoming increasingly more attractive. Vic's lodge--Vern and Anne stayed over there the weekend , is really beautiful. Lois' too, althought it was a trifle jammed with Hugh, Claire and the kids. And of course the general facilities have undergone tremendous improvement through the efforts of our task force. However it is far from Iriqois Falls. I have noted your comments about holding tanks for toilets---I will turn them over to Jim to consider. There are several ideas being considered, along with their place in our lengthy list of priorities.

I am enclosing a note with this letter recognizing the debt for what you paid for the lot. I am unable to say what my intentions are -- I dont have any money-- I live like the lilies of the field, I dont have a car to get out there easily,and I am very far from being retired. But we will see.

I gather Ruth and Lois enjoyed their stay with you

Are you getting Intercontiental Press--the weekly international news journal which we publish from New York. It would seem to me just what you would find most u useful. It costs $15 a year from ICP, P.O. Box 116, Village Station, New York, N.Y. 10014. U.S.A.

fraternally

Ross Dowson

August 14, 1972
Toronto

New York

Dear Bryan;

I received the two copies of your note to Coral this morning. She had already left for Oberlin so I have given one copy to John R who is going there tomorrow so that Coral can read it before tangling with any Pathfinderers.

Dont worry about the dealy in your return. The YS/LJS convention has also been postponed. In our opinion they have to be held in line ad the tendency spans both the youth and league and has as you know submitted the same documents. We planned th them before this way so we would not get into any organizational hangups about their violating league -youth relations and we are going to continue that way. Both conventions will be over the Chrsitmas holiday. Of course the sooner you can take this operation out onto the road and the campusesthe better but I doubt that another week will have any qualitative effect.

The thesis ??? When you arrive here on August 28th I hope that you are able to take up in hand what I will consider is the finished article--all set for you to make any changes that you want-to make it your own and pass every examination.

I have passed your note on to Gary. Yes ,why not invite Richard T to supper --he remians a man of mystery--of mysterious silence--but it is a family trait --I have been discussing with his brother Peter about the new translation equipment he has been preparing and I can see that he is quite friendly--but it is a deep and quite silent freidnliness. As for the affair that you are preoparing for me--you can cut out the Brahms and Beethoven and arrange for two extra shots of Brambuie or Countreau or Benedictine. All very good

Before you come back~~-boe~~ up on the Canada-US Relations document. It seems clear to me that the new leadership which we are attempting to forge in fire is dumping this past position--accepting the designation of the anti-US imperialist sentiment as being nationalist---and dismissing it as beig part of the radicliation-with the classic concept that all nationalism in an advanced capitalist country such as Canada is--is reactionary.

Looking forward to the Diego Rivera ~~xxxx~~ bauble.

all the best

Ross

MEMORANDUM ON THE AUGUST ISSUE OF LABOR CHALLENGE

The August 1972 issue of Labor Challenge marks a reversal of the line that the LSA-LSO has carried since the adoption at its 1968 convention of a document on Canada-U.S. relations. That convention characterized the anti-U.S. imperialist sentiment, already an important fact in Canadian politics, "as an elemental anti-imperialist sentiment, developing towards an anti-capitalist consciousness." We recognized it as having an "essentially radical character," and committed ourselves to "develop it" -- to intervene in it and raise its anti-Canadian capitalist level, which we said has proven to be implicit in it.

The August issue, designed for mass distribution during the B.C. elections studiously evades recognizing this element in the radicalization -- going so far as to excerpt almost all mention of the weight of U.S. capital investment in B.C. and some of the most glaring effects that this is having on the economic and social conditions of the B.C. working class -- an important factor in this radicalization. This takes on a grotesque and twisted form. In a few places where it cannot possibly evade coming to grips with life Labor Challenge writes of "foreign owned corporation," or "imperialist corporations", evading even designating them as U.S. -- U.S. capitialist owned, U.S. imperialist corporations. In a caption of a photo of a recent resources sacrifice to corporate profit -- it sides up to the question with the comment "in this case, a U.S. power company," when everyone knows it is a U.S. corporation in almost ALL cases. In the article on the "resources rip-off" the editors go through the tortuous process of mentioning the role of several corporations without conceding what is widely known -- that they are U.S. corporations.

It is unfortunate that this issue of Lab.r Challenge, with this implicit change of line comes out at this juncture when we are heavily involved in a crucial struggle with Waffle forces over the future of the left wing in the NDP. There is some danger that it can play into the hands of the pro-Movement for an Independent and Socialist Canada forces who seek to cover up their desertion of the fight with the NDP and trade union brass, by allowing them to challenge us as not even recognizing in anyway a political phenomenon which they falsely designate as the central issue of Canadian politics.

s/ Ross Dowson,
August 14, 1972.

August 22, 1972
Toronto

Vancouver

Dear Dick P (Principe)

I hope you got the History of the RR ok. That is much too important a book to be without, I thought, and therefore did not take advantage of your suggestion to put it in our library. Now with the paperback edition the price is such that any serious comrade should have a copyx I have often thought that if there is any one book that I would want--that is it--and so I shipped it to you in Gaw of Ruth B. I have put the rest in the Labor Challenge library where we can watch them as well as use them.

Since I have heard no further about your proposition--I take it that it has been worked out to your satisfaction with the other person you had in mind. If it did not perchance, dont hesitate to proceede

No doubt you have heard about the Laxer-Watkins splitaway. T~~hxxx

August 22, 1972
334 Queen Street West
Toronto

England
Dear Allan and Connie

-orry that you did not manage to get up here for a short visit. I was really looking forward to seeing you both after such a long gap. I had decided long ago not to go to Oberlin--not only because of the many things I am trying to do--you can appreciate that it is not exactly a staff workers holiday-but because I am pressing other leading comrades here to move in on these things , to get them to really know the leading SWPers and meet the various international personialities which for many years has been left to me . They --John R, Gary P, Dick F had all agreed but then at the last moments pulled back. But I see that Joan N ,Darrell F who has undergone quite a developments and some others went --And I hope you had the opportunity to discuss with them

So you missed our camp again--and all the worse as it is now at last really moving . Jim Mitchell has really banged back into the moveement and with a crew of of four comrades over this summer has stayed out there and transformed it. We must by now have about 9 sleeping cabins, an excellent baseball diamnond with backstop, a volley ball court, badminton court, horseshoes etc. The lodge has been panelled the well is operating. ..and we have had two extremely successful weekend schools of almost 100 so far

And of course you missed Crescent unless you had an opportunity to talk with Coral Sloan. This fall Crecsent should take off. I am in the process of writing Brian Belfonte's doctorate so he can pull together a pile of money painting in NY and then come up and take the operation on the road. The doctoral thesis is on the revival of the Marxist left xxm which the university might publish so it is worth our while. Brian is what we need to move out with our terrific agency set up--- NLB, Merlin, Monthly Review ,Pathfinder and Vanguard. A beautiful stock arrived over the last couple of days and we are just about ready for the campuses to open up. Then too you would have seen that we have taken over more space here at 334. We have kicked out the poll hall and set up a fine central office operation and layout print shop upstaris. We have taken over everything but about 2,500 sq feet which we will be wanting in about 11/2 years. But man and woman doesn't live by bread alone

I am sure you must be wondering what is happening here--what with the withdrawl of the ~~xxxx

We have a big leadership problem here. As a pan-Canadian force it went through a big crisis during my last absence. One of mai aspects is that there is nothing between me (as an individual--in the US they have a score of my generation) and the Riddell generation. And while we have a fine group of comrades of the Ridell generation who do good things they have proven nto to have formed a team and in my opnion have not really moved in and taken real leadership responsibilities. They have left it to me. Well I am pulling back-and forcing them forward. The experience is somewhat shocking but I know of no other course. We are making mistakes but generally we have been rectifying them. The Quebec document posed some new problems--the question of a Quebec labor party and the menaing of the PQ experience which xxxxxt they havent answ ered yet but are coming to grips with. John R and othershave pulled back on the liquid- ation of the youth paper and a weekly LC --this weeks PC meeting will see the product of their re-thinking which will generally be ok.There is only one important political difference that has been revealed--that is around this continuing and widening anti- U.S. imperialist senitment--but what is involved here is not yet clear as they h ave not presented their aamendment to the political resolution.

There is some tension and some anxiety but there is no question whatsoever that we are coming through it. The foundations of the movement are well laid and hard even if the superstructure at this time is a little soft and tremulous. The comrades in the Toronto East branch of which I am a member xxxxxxdid a job on Walter Davis and another member of the Revolutionary Communist tendency when they tried to make some- thing of the conven ion postponment. They fully understood that the RCT's -- purely factional and xxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxxx destructive the younger comrades

And we are just coming through a experience with the Waffle that is proving very salutaory. The established leaders Watking and Alxer at the first whiff of grapeshot have pulled out of the NDP to build what they are calling a Committe for an Indepen dent Canada. Our comrades have led the struggle to stay in the NDP and fight the social democratic and TU brass. Just prior to the conference in London last weekend which saw th consúmation of the split a preparatory meeting was held to re-establish a socialist caucus. A whole group of former ultra lefts who we had been trying to educate turned the meeting into nothing but eulogies for the LSA--how it had been correct all along etc etc. If we did nt know better we would have thought that they were trying to put the Trotskyist label on the causus so that the right wing could proscribe it along with the LSA.

of Red Mole

The recent issue with the unsigned attack on the Healy group for its entirely correct line on the labor party came into the store just in time for it to be picked up by our Old Mole-Red Circle tendency in Waffle and up at the u of T. You can be sure we brought this item to their attention--they have been heavily influenced by the IMG. The Red Mole article caught them at a good time as they have been moving away from this whole position within the NDP and the struggle with the Laxer-Watkind splitters. The IMGer who turned up at Fredericton and was imediately inducted tinto the tendency cirlce was not too impressed with [illegible] A young Fredericton comrade told Art that he ridiculaed the tendency after attneitng their meeting as not having the guts to split. IMGer Ted Harding was back in Toronto last month. He moves quite freely amongst some of our ex's and our tendency but hardly does more than call in on our headquarters. We had him give a forum on the opposition inside the USSR. In the course of his speech he led me to believe that he supported individual terror in the USSR. Well,Tariq transported the Argentine line to Quebec and the Ernet-Giseła contribtuion in reply to Joe laid the basis for guerrilla action almost anywhere bourgeois democratic norms did not prevail , so it is not suprising that someone would apply it to the Soviet areas. Peter Horbatiuk when Ted went a little deeper in reply to my point [illegible] raised the whole question right out into the open a and very boldly. Ted waffled. So I made a short contribution that if there was anywhe re our position was defined it was in the USSR . That is just what Stalin accused us of --conducting a campaign of terror and assasinations in the 1930's and Trotsky responded in great detail with the Marxist viewpoint. Ted was particularly uneasy about the whole thing and you might hear about it

Which takes us to the Mill split-away. The Cdn section has been a prison for some ye years for Mill and company. The only thing that kept them in was the international. What's changed. ? Maybe they got some bad advise when in England. More likely Mill has succumbed to the pressure of the forces that he has around himboth within the movement and outside it They are all really though with the LSA/LSO. They have been trying to p ovoke us into expelling them--but we havent to their apparent consternation. Our impression is that they were intending to appear at the September convention with an organized group and seek recognition as a syampthizing group a-la-Argentina--and possibly they even thought that their supporters in the world movement would put real pressure on us to accept such a status. Our feeling was that the RCT within the league is in reality a division of labor agreeably arrived at. Possibly the postponment of the convention has made real difficulties for them for they are all through with the league and time is against them---those in the league further wasting their time and those outside on some considerable pressure to move and tell us their full program in a press and organization of their own.

I read all the material that you sent over on the IMG congress--I thought that the tendency's documentation was as usual of a high order. It was a real break that they published a bit of a synopsis in the Mole. I hope you have lots of copies on hand to present to anyone who wants to know what you are doing in that operation. Poor Pat Jordan--a sad picture. What is he doing now! I see Healy has beat us to the punch with a super bookstore. Well your sales should go up. No doubt the congress firmed up the tendency considerably . Very good-for it seems to me from afar that we dont know where the IMG is going

But I must drop Toni a line-she sent me a long and interesting letter a week or so ago. I gather that she has come through it all now. Met Mary up at the Orillia branch where she gave a report on the IMG but I did not have a real chance to talk to her.

Drop us a line when you have the time.

Warmest regards

Ross

August 22, 1972
334 Queen Street W
Toronto

Nottingham England

Dear Inni (F. and Frank

Oh to be in England as the class struggle continues to mount.

It was good to get your note---all the more that Alan and Connie had to cut their trip to Oberlin short and not come up to see us here in Toronto. I pressed others to go to Oberlin so that I could hold the fort here. Of course we had Mary here--I attended the Orillia branch meeting where she gave a short report on the IMG congress ---but I havent as yet had a chance to talk with here persomally. And she must be leaving shortly. She came right in to George and Bea's place in Richmond Hill which is now an operation of its own--with its own headquarters and much stepped up activity. When the north Yonge subway getsto Finch about 1 1/2 years from now it will siphon the crowd right into their headquarters doorway.

Yes, big developments with the Waffle. All in all the split initiated by Laxer and Watkins is a setback for the left as a whole. But a new left will be constituted on quite a wide basis and on much better terms--fredd of that old elitist leadership. Our capital has risen considerably. A week before last Sundays split conference we pulled together key forces to lay the basis of a new left caucus. The air was full of eulogies about the LSA ,how we had seen things crrectly--how our analysis of the NDP was the only correct one. It was so muhc and coming from such wide forces--Steve Penner and others--that I was beginning to suspect that it was a plot to get the NDP brass to proscribe the new caucus as they have proscribed the LSA- But they all meant well.

The London conference all preapred by Watkins-Laxer to split the operation was a big success for us--we got at least 140 persons to the caucus meeting and left Watkins-Laxer without any of the key forces. It is probable that the new Movement for an Indpendent and Socialist Canada wont even get off the ground. Of course Peter H played a big role at the conference,along with Hans M and a new woman comrade of ourslIz Barclay--a really able popularizer and educator. I havent heard a detialed report yet--our branch meets tonight. But the LC coverage will no doubt be very full.

I will remind Peter to go around and re-establish connections with Don. Don should really move into the riding association there. It is one of the better ones An the Toronto area. It is 100 % pro-Waffle---well 99 % as Brewin is a member and candidate-elect .Bruce Kidd who was the provincial candidate is a leading Waffler ---when I last heard he was supporting the Laxer-Watkins line. His wife is better. What the Waffle split does for the Woodbine riding I do not know. I have the distinct impression that Don did not renew his subscription to Labor Challenge--did he say anything about our press.

Yes, Connie and Al would not have known about the Mill split until they got the paper. Of course it was not completely unexpected by us. Mill and company have actually been outside our movement for a long time--the timing of the split suprised us ~~mxtm~~ The only reason why Mill has remained inside our movement is the international situation. He has long been under pressure of various persons around him--some who have never been in our movement and others who are drop-outs , to pull out of the LSA. Perhaps this pressure finally became too great--then again it is not at all excluded that he got some bad advice from some of the IMG leadership. Our impression is that they may well have decided ~~xxxx~~ to try and set up something like Argentina---an official section and a symapthizing group---they carry the line that the LSA is much more degenerate than the LSA and of course the longstanding position of theirs that

(this idea has some support from Pierre)

not exactly giving leadership these days--in the face of the Bolivian debacle and now both the terrible toll that the Argentine bourgeoisie are taking of our ERP comrades and the successes of the Moreno forces.

I passed your comments on to Liz Angus. It is good to hear your comments about ~~the~~ our paper. I am awfully close to it here and it is interesting to get a longer view. It is paralyzing that we do not have a British press. It is hard to follow developments over there from the Star and G and M which of course give better coverage than that NY Times. I am hoping that some solution soon comes to this problem--as I know you are all. The odd time I take time out to scan Healy's paper--I can hardly bring myself to bother about the Mole--but feel compelled to a bit because its the inspiration of our tendency

I read the key documents of t e IMG conference that came over. --and thought that the tendency came through very strong. Cant understand Pat and Toni's actions. From here it would seem that the IMG could blow up at any moment--or that at any time anything can happen. The pressure for the regroupment of all who consider themselves Trotskyists is a big challenge in England--it confronts even the sectarian and opportunist elements. Yes it would seem that anything could happen in England. All the more with the rising tempo of the class struggle. I gather from a few comments that we are able to live in the IMG ~~xxx~~ these days

It is good to see that you Toni are back on the job again----I suppose you Frank continue to increase your influence among your work mates and the union.

warmest regards

Ross

August 22, 1972
334 Queen Street W
Toronto 133
363 9618

924 9511 X744

Mr. Crossthwaite
Toronto Public Library--Baldwin Room

Dear Sir;

I have pixked up the issue of Workers Vanguard and the microfilm copy that you were so gracious to give me. I also picked up your note but decided to take it with me in order to answer it in a more considered way.

According to my records this is what you now have from me--whidh are all related;

A--Labor News--Ukrainian language organ of the Canadian section, published in Toronto November 1933 to March 1938

I see that there has recently been published; Leon Trotsky; a bibliography by Louis Sinclair, Stanford, Hoover Institution Press 1972, 1,089 pages $35.00 Your microfilm which I designated A, above, is noted in this work. The title as you have it listed is somewhat cryptic. I would think it would be better to list it as Labor News-- Ukrainian language press of the Canadian Trotskyist movement, published in Toronto November 1933 to March 1938

B-- Newspapers
1-Workerx 1922-29 8 issues only
2- October Youth 1933-34 (later Young Militant)
3- Vanguard 1932-36
4- Socialist Action 1938-42
5 - May Day Manifesto 1944

This microfilm that I mark B contains the beginnigs of the revolutionary socialist press in this country. I think item one in it is incorrectly listed. To my knowledge I loaned you all this material although it is not exluded that you added something from your own files. A table of contents which you returned with the original listed Workers World Vol 1 No 1, then 10 issues of Workers Guard published over 1921 ,then 4 more issues over Jan -Feb 1922, and only three issues of The Worker . This of course if terribly incomplete--the Worker published for many years after that . Correctly speaking ,if they were available,all the Workers published up until 1928 under the editorship of Maurice Spector belong in this file. At that time there was a big change in polit ical line and Maurice Spector, and a few laters Jack MacDonald who had been executive secretary of the Communist Party who published this paper,were removed and commenced to publish their own paper. So we would trace continuity from the Workers until 1928--then to Vanguard--which you have on this film 1932-36. then to Socialist Action 1938-42

Continuing forward you would go to C-Labor Challenge 1945 June 1--1952. There is a break, then you continue to Workers Vanguard which I will call D which I think you have on two films . This ends with January 26 1970 and reappears as Labor Challenge. There is no break in the continuity of Workers Vanguard January 1970 to Labor Challenge which is continuing to be published on a twice monthly basis. I will bring up a file to you when we get to a convenient gathering point.

On microfilm B . There are two items--numbers 2 and 5. Number 2 is a revolutionary socialist (Trotskyist) youth paper. You have a complete file for that period. It commenced publication again at a later date and is appearing today as Young Socialist. I am pulling together a file of that and when it is complete will show it to you for your consideration.

A correct general listing for this material would be Revolutionary socialist press (Canada) After 1928 with a split which had world-wide ramifications it would be correct to call the one branch Trotskyist (derived from Leon Trotsky, its foremost representative) or Fourth International--a world widde movement organized by Trotsky following what he considered to be a degeneration of the Third International under Stalin. The other branch could be designated Communist Party, capital C and capital P . The term Stalinist could also be used but some proponents of this view object since N Khrushchov's revelations to the 20th Congress of the Communist Party of the USSR of Stalin's crimes, while others proudly accept it.

I hope that this information is of use to you.

sincerly

R.D

September 7, 1972
334 Queen Street West
Toronto 133

Dear Bert Groves
Harry Clairmont
Joe Silver

I have been intending to contact all of you and anyone else you might suggest for some time now

For sometime now over the past years I have been writing bits and snatches of a history of the revolutionary socialist movement in Canada. In the next immediate period I intend to step up that work, however as you can imagine there are tremendous gaps in the material that is necessary to do a serious job.

As you all know a key, a central personality in any history for a whole period was Jack MacDonald. But there is practically nothing around on Mac. A recent book called Soldiers of the International re-establishes Mac as a central figure--- in fact with his expulsion this book, published by the U of T Press, has a central turn take place in the history of the CP. Over last year in various articles celebrating 50 years of the CP the Stalinists have raised all their old lies about Mac--that he was a Lovestonite and American ~~sectionalist~~ Exceptionalist etc etc. So I would very much like to write an appreciation of Mac

I am hoping that you can help me with this project--and or can suggest others who can. I am sending along with this note the only item around on Mac--written by Sadie Jourard. I hope that it stimulates you all.

It would be very good if you could search through your memories for anything and everything about Mac you can recall--let me decide as to its worth from an over all point of view. Perhaps you would write it out but then again you might feel more free just sitting back with a glass of Scotch in your hand and a microphone attached to a cassette or tape recorder --and just let things roll. I am sure Hazel would add many things to your memory Bert--and perhaps you Joe and Harry woul get together. Of course I am available to help in anyway you think useful. If you put things on tapes I will get them transcribed and send them back to you to look over and correct if you want. It would be very good for me that you would take this project up right away--not procrastinate.

Perhaps this is too early but with the great rise of interest among woman about their role in society there would be some value if you would tell me what you know about Ross---and another woman who seems to be of increasing interest--Florence Custance--an English school teacher who was in the top leadership with Mac for a while and who was muscled out by Buck and co, very early as a dissident.

I would like very much to hear from you about this--either way. My phone number is Toronto 363-3204 and the best time to phone me is about 11 at night. I can often be reached in the daytime at either 368-9618 or 364-5908

fraternally

Ross Dowson

8

September 8, 1972
Toronto

Vancouver

Dear comrade Gerry Diamond

I was more than happy to answer your letter. You raise an important matter --one that not only involves and is important to us as the nucleus of the revolutionary vanguard that must win the active support of the advanced layers of the working class , but with which I happen to have a high degree of personal involvement. in. Believe me I felt very badly about ~~xxxx~~ our dropping the label and believe me I did everything that I could possibly do so that we would not have to.

My father was always a member of the typographical union. If you know any old timers in the trade you might ask them if they know a Walter Dowson--he was very well-known, perhaps not so much as a union activist but as a top printing trade craftsman who was always union. For years he was head of the Hunter Rose composing room and held a top job on the Eaton's catalogue. During the 1921 strike, as it stretched out and the strike pay could not support his wife and five children I guess it was at that time ~~xx~~ and every one else was trickling back to work, he packed off to the United States and worked in Chicago on the Sears Roebuck catalogue etc etc. He built a superb collection of books on the art and technique of printing--particularly color and design and at the time of his death was working on a bibliography on color printing.

When I joined the Trotskyist movement I found our rather small forces highly involved in the organization of the Bookbinders Union. ~~xxxxxxx~~ The head of the Bookbinders union here in Toronto for many years was Bert Groves. Bert was in those crucial roganising years a leading activist of the Trotskyist movement and was given essential know-how and advise by our comrades and in particular Jack MacDonald, our executive secretary who for years had been head of the Patternmakers Union. If you will look back at the papers over the years you will see that we always carried the union label and not just the typo label or binders --but the label of the Allied Printing Trades Council. Bert was for years head of the label committee. Bert is a top official of the Bookbinders still but he must be now about 65 or so , he had to move to Ottawa for the union and he has dropped to the side of the movement. The comrade who was editor of the paper before me has a long record of unionism --for a period when he was off staff he was a leading activist in the steelworkers . I myself, for the short period that I worked as a precision lathe operator and surface grinder operator played I think a useful role in the organizing of the Acme Screw and Gear local of the United Steelworkers.

I was suprised to read from your letter that you hail from Toronto and were involved in the typo strike here. I hope you have had time to read our coverage of that struggle. Did you know Bob McCormack of the typos. As adleader of the movement I had a long and fraternal relationship with Bob--who ran the union office for many years--he was sympathetic to us. When we set up our modest shop --we had a ~~xxxxxxxxxx~~ Chief he tried to get a label for us but the regulations made it impossible--it did not matter that you had some red-hot unionists-what you had to have was a real operating printing shop with considerable capital. To get the label you had to have a journeyman in all three trades. So for sometime we printed the paper and instead of moving into our own setting operation in order to carry some label--in this case the typos-we sent our copy out to be set to Sam Lipshitz's shop. It was about this time that the big Goss Webb offset presses hit Toronto and a veritable flood of community and left-wing papers started to appear. Along with the Webb came the new setting processes.

We soon found that the new setting processes , the cold type processes cost half the hot type processes at Sam's. There was no question that the quality was better but the cold type was improving. I immediately contactethe typos and asked them about union label cold type shops---they had none. I raised some hell as it was obvious to anyone that hot type could not survive under such circumstances--and not just hot type as a technique but the workers who were only trained as linotypers. I told them what they obviously knew--that they had to put on a real organising drive of the cold type shops which were springing up everywhere. We did nothing abou the paper--we continued to pay twice the price for holt type setting that we knew we would have to pay for the cold. Then one day I had a real down to earth discussion with our comrade who was doing all the press work. After some investigation he showed me that we could not even buy the supplies--the paper and the negatives and plates and ink for what a new big Webb shop would charge us for the finished peper. On top of the supplies our comr drs also had to do about 7 hours press work, let the paper dry, then bundle it up and take it over to a binder, get it into his work line-up, then pick it up for us to mail it. As you can appreciate we could not wait for the binders pick up and delivery. ~~His~~ the fellow who had taken Bob(s job

I got in touch with ~~him~~ who knows us as a movement of unionists--a movement that is not just for union conditions in this or that shop but in all shops and in fact for the workers to own and control all shops. ~~Meanwhile~~ I had told Sam Lipshits that we were having to consider going into cold type and he had alre dy contacted the union and asked them what were they going to do about this competition to his operations. The uion told me that none of the big Goss Webb offset presses were organized--they did tell me about one shop that was setting cold type and was organized however. I phoned this outfit. It turned out that the boss of this shop had brough t in a small unit for special jobs, the shop had a label but he himself was operating the unit.. Oh ,yes there was another shop that had a unit but it was also setting hot type and it was chanrging the same--in other words making a make-off--if I recall corretly the boss was operating this too--which he could do as they would not get many jobs for it ~~so~~ So I phoned up the union and told them about these operations and they agreed that they really didn't have anything

So here was the situation we were faced with--~~which~~ could we justofy laying out the very hard earned money of our comrades (we have comrades who make a pledge of $28.00 a month on a 55 a week pay) to pay twice the amount of money for setting and I am not sure but about twice the amount for printing than modern technology(not slave labor but un-skilled and unorganized labor) ~~can~~ justifies. And that doesn't even corr ectly pose the question. We want to expand the paper---more pages and greater periodici ty. We want to carry the message of unionism and socialism more roundedly and more often Unfortunately the failure of the unions to organise these tecniques was completely blocking us from doing these very necessary things

As you know the workers who employ these new techniques are not scab, nor are at least the big operations sweated labor--any more sweated than your shop. I do not know what they are paying their operators of the Goss Webb but I would not at all be supris ed to hear that they were making even more than the workers who do not opartate such modern machines but are organized. With machinery that is qualitatively more effic ient a boss can well afford to pay even higher than the present union scale ~~that~~ That is probably why the union hasn't been able to organize those shops.

In this kind of situation whereas the label used to signify better labor conditions it no longer does so. It tends to take on sort of a protection of a job trust. Certain shops like Thistle and Everready(CP-owned) are guaranteed business authentically for the simple reason that they have the label and the union has established in certain circles that all printing has to have the label. A harsh word but am I wrong in saying that it has become a ~~protection~~ form of blackmail for little oerations like ours.

If ,as we really want to do--we put our paper into a union label shop--carried the label--put our paper into a union label operation--I am afraid that we will have to cut back to 8 pages and we would have no possibility at all of going weekly in the near future.

As soon as I got your letter I asked comrade Ian Angus to send Southam-Murray a copy of our paper for an estimate. Today a letter came in from them. I am sending it on to you. I think that it is self expanatory. They say that they cannot compete with the Goss type press. I am sure if it was a matter of wages they wouldn't have hestitated to bring that up. I dont t ink they object to printing our type of paper--a revolutionary socialist paper--although I must say when Merchants Press closed down and I was taking the paper around to various union shops it was clear to me that some shops did not want to touch us because of our politics. One shop where we did print it for a while use to dealy us and delay us and I finally con fronted them with questions as to the cause. He let me know that it was compromising h for him with many of his customers who came into the shop for them to see him printing this type of paper. He said he would appreciate it if we would take it selswhere. No I dont think in this case either wages at Murray's due to it being union or our paper because it is revolut onary socialist are the reasons--they are in all probab ilty the ones they give----their presses are not competitive for this type of job with the Goss-type press.

Toronto went under because the union's did not move in on these new techniques and organize the workers. I am afraid that Vancouver and elsewhere are going to go under too unless they organize. I hope that in someway the Challenge can help organize these workers but it certainly wont aid in the processby going back to eight pages and dumping all perspective of greater periodicity

I am sending you the letter that Southam-Murray sent us. Why not get a copy made of it and show it to the boys. Tell them that you went down to the Vanguard bookstore and they gave you the above line and a copy of te letter

I am hoping that I have answered your enquiries--but dont hesitate to send some more ~~something~~ arguement my way if you have any

fraternally

Ross Dowson

personal use only

Sunday September 30, 1972

An astonishing discussion with John R yesterday afternoon. For about half an hour between working on the partition in the pool hall with George. Why do these meetings have to be such an outpouring of my greivances and uneasuness--why dont I just sit back and listen--I am seeking vindication of my views instead of trying to find out how these comrades are thinking--w at they are going through and what useful role I can play.

I cannot even develop an order of recollection. But it was a very significant meeting--completely unheralded of course. John told me that the talk about the problem of method--that orgy that took place over the Canada-US relations document was all wrong. There is no truth at all in the claims that everyone made and dominated that plenum and which dominate that plenum...the claims that the fuudanetmal problem that differentiated them from 1968 and who knows what else was that I had been proceeding not from our principled positions but from tactical and conjunctural considerations. When I pointed out to John that this was not a small correction of something that he had said but that it infected the entire leadership he said yes--and piinted out that Phil had reverted back totally to his Engler-Rands viewpoint. These comments were tied in with assurances from him in response to my demand that he either cease talking about erors of the past or put up. He said that he had been wrong--that there were no long range, there was no pattern of errors. Instead of sittting back and letting him explain why and how he developed his pervious line I burst in --with gratitutde I would suppose you could say. Yes, how could I really write a history of the movement--all this talk had unhinged everything, made it impossible to make a judgement on what was useful and valid.

Somewhere in the process he mentioned that he had read my notes scribbled on the margins of John Steele's draft on Canada-US Relations . It seems to me that only now ,in the last few days, had he read them--remarkable when you consider the things that he has said about my responsibility for the dirorientation of the leadership.He thought they were excellent and valueable. Again I cut him off saying that I had asked the CO for them as they properly belong to me but had been told that they had been lost. They are in the desk drawer he siad. Then probably then he told me about a letter that Mandel had sent off to NY upon reading the CO's draft political resolution--a declaration of war. I expressed shock that I had not been shown this letter but that had been told in vague ways by Jack B and the CO about responses that are sure to come with my line on Canadian nationalism. I asked why I had not been shown this letter--he replied that he had only got a copy following our plenum

I told h im that I wasn't going to go into the CO and paw through the correspondence file--but that I expected that he would show me such key correspondence

Then he [illegible] interruption --taken up two days later

We had a few words about the Quebec situation. J sought to explain the failure to come to grips with Alain and his views as being due to his not being part of this leadership and its common experience and in a sense his coming forward in conflict w ith a part of it--namely Art and Penny.

I cannot recall anything more

John said something to the effect that he was not going to write all the documents — I know there is a paralysis but what form?

They are proceeding with the chairmanship — the failure to pick up my trotsky article signified nothing according to him

October 1, 1972
Comments on [illegible] PC meeting.

we have delayed with my report on the plenum in LC matter & John R leaving Australia

The question of my being named chairmann came up. Stu moved that it be tabled--he would like to think about it. But [illegible] I think that it was I who raised the question as to how this would appear to the comrades away from the center, that he would have to append a note or something to the minutes. At anyrate a discussion opened on this question. Gary made a statement [illegible] ...about the continnity of leadership, our tradition,,what makes us different as revolutionists from the Old Mole and Red Circle--that we are part of the contunitiy of the struggle to build the vanguard party--that my being chairman would be in effect a statement within the international that unlike the IMG which has rejected the past,we stand firmly on it --the whole tradition of the F.I. John S made a contribution which according to Dennis was somewhat different-- had to do with the defining of the executive secrtary and the chairman's work
Stu brushed this aside--it is a political question. Then he stated that he wasn't for pushing aside the old guard at all--but that the movement has just had a political experience--with English -Cdn nationalism--we rejected it--the debate was not too real but there was no defence of th e 1968 position of the movement of which Ross was the leading exponent.
--we turned away from the 1968 resolution and then reversed it---
this ia a political problem
Jacquie did not minimize the political problem but rather stated that if we threw out the leadership over every error it made we would have no tradition--in a sense we would always be looking for scapegoats. The plenum didn't throw out anything but rahter tried to take hold of the movement--she said she rejecte d any concept that our past politics hav e been thrown out--that a new movement was born at the plenum
John R said referral of the movement inacceptable--we cannot evade this question. it involves what kind of movement that we are building--one built on foundations of the past. Refers to IMG--how it is imbued with the concept that we are a new movement--out with the old Trotskyism. We are not breaking with the past--we have not been adherents of the method that is false. Have we built this movement on some wrong foundations. If we have then lets talk about that and not a [illegible] position on Canadian nationalism. A Cdn nationalism position was adopted at the last plenum. --as for the pervious position the movement as a whole assumed responsiblity
Gary asked Stu shouldn't [illegible] he (Gary) be organizational secretary for his presentation of the memorandum--and referred to the fact that the plenum had voted unanimously for clause 2 rejecting "bourgeois" national ism
Press came up--some confusion--I raised this with John R before--did the plenum take a decision re jornal to disperse funds--after all we are in the midst of a pre-convention discussion and there are at least three documents on press--if we disperse the fuds of the journal that writes finish to the discussion by an organizational means--we had to take a decision on youth publication as we were publishing it and therewere moves to stop doing so--we reaffirmed what was but with the journal and funds we have a different problem tabled
SO THE CHIKENS ARE COMING HOME TO ROOST. Stu is preparing an addenda to the minutes. What is the leadership going to do. They are now being challenged as to the significance that they themselves tnended to give to the plenum. It is entirely logical that the tendency and Stue should interpret my not being given a post and the line of arguement at the p plenum--that we have proceeded from a false mehtodology--as signifying a definitive turn that would downgrade me---Stu told the leadership several weeks ago thatthe talk in the tendency was of a power struggle in the P C and that a coup had taken place with my ouster.

How is the leadership going to cope with Stu's statement they now have ----Stu showed me a draft quoting me--I told him that I did not say what he attributed to me but that it was correct in general though and I asked that he quote John who gave the report--he dismissed what they said as being crap--I said the relevant things according to him . Later he wanted to show it to me but I said that I would see it later--he is jubliant.

Yes, how are they going to cope with it. Is it true that the John R'S Gary's --is there any difference among them-John S and Jacquie-- did not proceed with me as chairman for the "reasons" john R gives or did they really not want to--did they really carry a line in their circles that we have a new ball game now and then decided rethought the whole thing and left the Stu's up in the air.

They also have the MISC problem---the statement made in the elections by the Ont Waffle.... doesn't express any substnatial change in policy — justoutside the NDP--with individuals saying they support NDP. Ironically yesterday's Star carried Lewis on the piepleine--it would appear that they are now moving out boldly on Canada-US relations. How is the leadership going to handle this. It can continue to leave all mention of Canadian antiiperliaism out of the paper--but what are they thinking. So John says no methodoligical problem--

I have a feeling after discussing with John S and Darrell about last Oc October 2 East branch meeting that the leadershipproblems is seen by John as something considerably bigger than I see it . I see it as involving about ten persons really moving in boldly and taking over all the respnsibilities of leadership which they had previously failed to do for various reasons. But John S when talking about priorities and the pre-conven ion discussion gave me a feeeling that the whole branc his in this crisis. We now appear to have about 10 persons allocated to typ ing bulletins--we have no one to give forums except types like Wayne ing

The Big 10 appear to feel that they stand on the edge of an abyss,

-30-

Stu(s position on the chairmanship being assumed by me was preceeded by by the September 27 meeting notice of motion that the PC repudiate the Maritime intervention xmdm. How are they going to react to that-- particularly John R who dissociated hi self from the whole thing while in Europe. I have not seen this dossication but only received hints that no doubt Stue and others in tendency have heard. The tendency is certainly goading the leadership.

Joan N

MINUTES OF THE POLITICAL COMMITTEE, October 1, 1972

Convened: 2:10 PM

ATTENDANCE: Chair: Mike Secretary: Macdonald
P.C. Present: Ruby, Brock, Connolly, Crandall, Laboissiere, Courtney, Pedersen, Fleming, Kent, Marlon, Saunders, Macdonald.
P.C. Absent: Brennan, Page.
Invited: Mike.

MINUTES: M/C to adopt the minutes of September 17,1972.
M/C to adopt the minutes of September 21, 1972.
M/C to accept the minutes of September 27, 1972 with the correction that Fleming be added under "P.C. Present".

POLITICAL BUREAU REPORT: Report by Crandall

1. MOTION: that D.M. be transferred from the Vancouver Branch to the Montreal Branch. CARRIED.
2. Saunders, a member of the Political Committee, has informed the Central Office that he has declared his adherence to the positions of the Revolutionary Communist Tendency.

WOMEN'S LIBERATION: Report by Crandall

MOTION: that Ruby be assigned as cross-Canada co-ordinator of our women's liberation work. CARRIED

CHAIRMANSHIP OF THE LSA/LSO: Report by Crandall

MOTION: that comrade Ross Dowson be elected Chairman of the LSA/LSO.

MOTION: by Saunders - that the decision be referred to the next meeting of the Political Committee. DEFEATED

In Favor: Saunders
Opposed: Fleming, Marlon, Connolly, Ruby, Brock, Crandall, Labossiere, Courtney, Pedersen.

MAIN MOTION: CARRIED

In Favor: Macdonald, Marlon, Connolly, Ruby, Brock, Crandall, Kent, Labossiere, Courtney, Pedersen, Fleming.
Opposed: None
Abstention: Saunders (see statement appended)

SPLIT OF MONTREAL UNIFIED TENDENCY FROM THE LSA/LSO: Report by Crandall

Presentation of the line of a reply to the statement of the splitters to the LSA/LSO.
MOTION: to adopt the line of the reply as outlined.
CARRIED.

ADJOURNMENT: M/C to adjourn at 3:45 PM

STATEMENT MOTIVATING A REFERRAL OF THE LSA/LSO by Saunders ON THE MOTION TO ELECT ROSS DOWSON AS CHAIRMAN

I have been asked by comrades on the Political Committee to make this statement to explain why I moved to refer the motion on Ross Dowson's election to the post of chairman of the LSA/LSO. Such a motion was felt to be a serious matter in the present context and I fully agree.

I moved the referral, not because I doubted the devotion of this comrade to the interests of the movement as he sees them, and not because I question the courage and tenacity shown by this comrade in the 37 years of his involvement in the struggle for Trotskyism in Canada, or do I wish to deny his actual positive contribution to this struggle. The question is not one of past records or personalities.

I made the motion for the following specific reasons.

1. It was the first ti e that I had become aware of the proposition, and I felt I needed time to think through the implications of the motion and its initial motivations.

2. The initial motivation given by the Executive Secretary seemed quite vague.

3. A motivation given by a comrade later in the discussion, while by far the clearest statement on the whole matter, had embedded in it ce tain political problems. The following is a paraphrase of that contribution which has been approved by the speaker:

"... to do otherwise (elect comrade Ross Dowson to the Chairmanship of the LSA/LSO) would be a repudiation of Trotskyism and of all the League's traditions. The action is not primarily honorific but political. Individuals are the embodiment of ideas. By this action the League leadership reaffirms to the section membership, the Fourth International and the braad left, its full adherence to its program, traditions and methodology."

The problems with this motivation are two-fold. First the leadership is reaffirming its traditions and methodology by organizational means in the absence of a clear and rounded statement of political positions at this conjuncture. Of the three line documents submitted so far to the convention discussion, all have been withdrawn or are subject to ammendment. No new line documents have been submitted to the convention discussion for over three months.

Secondly, it is generally known that comrade Ross Dowson holds minority views on the question of Canadaian nationalism which have yet to be fully spelled out. It would seem incumbent on the Political Committee to clarify, if only in outline form, the depth and nature of the differences, to assure comrades, especially those who adhere to the majority at this time, that these differences are not of a profound and methodological nature. After all, comrades, individuals <u>are</u> the embodiment of ideas. The political positions of leading comrades are not a matter of indifference to the Central Committee and to the movement as a whole.

STATEMENT BY CRANDALL

The report of the Executive Secretary to the Political Committee proposing comrade Ross Dowson's election as Chairman centred on the following point. The present transition in our leadership takes place in the framework of a continuity in leadership, reflected in comrade Ross Dowson's continuing role in the leadership. The continuity in our leadership reflects in turn a deeper continutity in the principles and program of the LSA/LSO. We should give this continuity concrete expression in our allocation of bi-national posts, by accompanying the election of a new Executive Secretary with the election of comrade Ross Dowson as cross-Canada Chairman of the LSA/LSO.

Previously we have elected comrades from Quebec, and earlier from Vancouver to the post of chairperson, with a view to concretizing in this way the LSA/LSO's cross-Canada character and enabling a leading comrade in a key area to make public statements in the name of the pan-Canadian movement. The question of electing a new chairperson was not posed for a vote at the September 2-4, 1972 Central Committee plenum to permit adequate time for leadership consultation on changing our use of the post of Chairperson.

We need no political resolution to reaffirm our continuity in leadership and program. It has never been challenged by any positions or decisions of the movement. If the election of a new cross-Canada Chairman is seen as an "organizational measure", it is only one of a continuing series of organizational and political measures which demonstrate this continuity to the movement and to the public at large.

Minority views comrades of the Political Committee may hold on this or that question should have no bearing on their competence to hold leadership posts in the cross-Canada movement. To maintain the contrary would be to apply the rule of monolithism in the building of our leadership.

Since the question of differences on Canadian nationalism has been raised, comrade Saunders should be reminded that the vote of the September 2-4, 1972 Central Committee plenum on the motion on Canadian nationalism was unanimous. As for the differences on Canada-U.S. relations expressed in the oral discussion, we do not know their significance, as the discussion is only beginning.

East Toronto branch meeting October 3, 1972

The most significant part of the meeting was Peter H's report supposedly on the first meeting of the new Left Caucus. After a few perfeunctory words about the conference Peter made an extensive personal report on the Red Circle. Its general character was to contrast its intervention in the constituency associ tions acrss the city and the fight for left resolutions at the coming very key Ont convention to our lack of participation--in one constituency association where we have 23 persons only 4 turned out etc etc. Coming out of that were some personal opinions that we have to t ake the Red Circle into our movement as a bloc right away. Darrell in his contribution in passing you might say stated that our priority at this time was not involvement in the NDP but was rather the pre-convention discussion. Earlier Stu had asid that we do not have a line on the NDP . With Darrell's revelation as organizer that we do not have the NDP as a priority at this time it became obvious what the basis of Peter's disorientation is. It would appear that Peter as NDP coordinator did not know what our actual concepts of the employment of our forces in the NDP are--that he heard as did we for the first time Darrell's concept of priorities. Of course the campaign is n ow half way through and we have the metro assembly this weekend--is this leadership going to make the necessary switch to the NDP election campaign ---and how is it going to come to grips with the situation that is building up towards some ill-conceivned unity maneuvers with the Red Cricle.

...the Red Circle has to be discussed on political grounds--its dis agreement apparently on Vietnam (none attended the VMC conference), its line on strikebreaking which shows an ignorance of the tu disution, its position on feminism and the NDP itself

Does the executives handling of the educational flow in some way from its concept of the priority of the convention discussion ? At anyrate at the actualy meeting itself it came in with a completely new concept of the ecuational On Jacquie's plenum report. Whereas we were slated to continue the discussion--about 6 names were on the list we are suddenly told that Lorna is going to present a synposis of Jacquie's report, that the tendency is going to give its position and then we will open discussion. Whatever merit there was in Lorna's presentation was of course completely eclipsed by the tendency's report. Dick attacked the leadership for confusion, not having an established position and attemtped to present a synposis of the various views that have been expressed by various leading comrades--he attacked the mass action prespective and projected so e kind of concept of forming united fronts with other socialist groups. It took up in part this latter concept which they are applying to the Vietnam work. They are not talking about united fronts whichare formed around specific questions but in reality of regroupment--a much more complex matter we are for united fronts for specific questions--- which on abortio and Vietnam are not directed to a handful of leftists who on these questions are ultra leftists but to the masses--we are out to win the rest of the left by showing them that we are making a serious attempt to move out to the masses and that we know how.

Then I stated that I did not see how Jacquie's report is an ammendment but that it is truly what we said at our meeting a suppl ment, a clarif ication a n expansion etc. Then I asked that some onetell me in what way Every mother ,,ever child etc is not feminist. Darrell took this up-- claimed that it had become the central slogan--that there is obvious differing interpreations of what we formally decided---but in fact it b became. Then he made some comments about the slogan itself--some women are mothers who dont want to be, some mother have chidren who are not wanted--are we telling them to be willing mothers and to now think in terms of wanting their unwanted child--hard to grasp what he was trying

to say Mike in his contribution expressed that we have to be wary of th e term mother and the term child-- This was not commented on further but it would appear that we have some ultra left reactions to the very concept of motherhood. Of course the main thing is that with the procedure on the ecuational completly disoriented the discussion-away from Jacquie's report on behalf of the PC into the hands of the tendency again

Incidental---Old Mole had only 2 persons at VMC conf--Red Ci Circle none. Kathy reported on our effort to involved Old Mole--their position sectarian--dont see possiblity of building a movement--want groupment of the revolutionists--tendency line. Stu characterized our l line on VMC as reformist. ~~Pat mentioned that the~~
It is apparent that the slate for the Metro executive will be challenged on a braod basis. Darrell is caught up with organizational detail that the exectuvie has disbanded the nominating committee and any suggestion that there be a report on the commission designed to strengthen the slate is demanding the exeutive resurrect the now dead commission. The nomihations are in someways not too good. Stu and Pat nominated Jim M, Ernie T, George Bryant, Lynda B, Marve, Wayne etc. Pat wanted imbedded into the motion that we are going to have an opportunity for various persions to give little eulogies for their nomienee like at the YS/LJS breakdown convention in Montreal.

Talk about crisis of leadership---I d ubt that I should attend branch meetings over the next period--in reality I play a disruptive role I think

October 4, 1972
334 Queen Street West
Toronto

Milton Alvin (SWP)
Los Angeles,

Dear Milt

Thanks for your note of the 25th on Kolko. I am unacquainted with the particular book of his you refer to "Limits of Power" and am looking forward to your review.

But I have been impressed ~~xxx~~ with other writings of his. He was at York University last year and our leading comrades in the anti-Vietnam war movement made contact with him at that time. I will have to check this out again but I recall the leading comrades in that area telling me that Kolko was not enthusiastic about our Vietnam work

We have a couple of quite sophisticatedaand able comrades in post graduate studies at York. I have shown one of them your note and stressed the value of his getting to know Kolko.

We have another interesting prof on York, the eminent student of George Lukacs--Mazieros. He has been refused permission to take up his post at York. But he came across from England to Canada so that he could fight it from here.in the courts. He university community has taken up his case. He has beenoffered a deal to take up his post for the next term and then decamp--but he publicly rejected it. I have had a comrade send some material on this case to the Militant. We will beim giving it good coverage I take it.

I will let you know if anything really good comes from our contacting Kolko again.

My regards to the comrades

socialist greetings

Ross Dowson

October 16, 1972

At the PC meeting John R xxxxxxxxxx proposals re the handling of the Press Report from the plenum for the bulletin went right ahead as if he had never seen or heard my suggestion to him of October 12--worse, when I raised the matter of circulating along with Al's report the Press Report the burea moved in extremely sharply to opose me. Dick gave a speech which included the "threat" that if it was passed to pub ish the press report that he would move that we publish a whole series of other documents dealing with press discussions over the past period. Art came in with some anecdote from Cannon etc. The bureau to a person reacted extremely sharply from the word go --I suggested an adjustment of the agenda that happened to parallel a suggest on of Stue's --very harsly lectured by the Chair about ti e, repitition etc etc. At several points when I attemp to make a suggest on the bureau acted to a person, interupptions, gestures so that at one point I just stopped speaking and gave up the floor and gave up a suggested ammendment.

The PC m etings are obviously only now designed to approve all the worked out proposaitions of the expanded bureau which operates as a bloc. There has been no political reports or discussions for a long period--all administrative. Yes one of the procdural disputes re agenda was over the long shceduled but never xxxx given report on the NDP left caucus lau ching meet ng. All we were slated to deal with relavant to this was a discussion on the Red Circle.

I gave John a detailed argued letter on how we should handle t his. John never talked to me about it but on several occasions up until t e October 15 PC m eting I suggested that Gary or John in their own capacity make the first simple moves---recognize receipt of the lette from the Circle, enthisiatically, ask them for any and all documentat an on this basis let them know and even spell it out a bit that a unification or fusion is a serious business and will take a little time and political discussions . I explained to them that there is a lot of heat in the Toronto movement to move on this and we should respond quickly this way which everyone will agree with. Unfort nate] John never talked to me about my note and n moves of an kind were taken until the PC meeting. About an hour before the PC m eting Dick and Art (not John for some reason) came up for a dsicussion. Dick appears to have been struck off to handle this . Couldn't have been worse choice--Dick is harsh and polemical just the type not wan ed t carry out such a task. They talked about the whole thing an it was obvious were intending to lay out a whole schemea which only shwoed not the diffic lties but the i possibility even t e undersireab lity of any fusion. I told them how we did not have to go into all that t just report the first key moves that set the whole tone. Dick gave a length detailed report on this question to the PC--extremely fac Of course this will all get back to the Red Circle and to the tende and to the comrades who of course want the addition to our forces t promises so much for our NDP work but who do not understand the pro of fusions. I gather Stu protested the report but unfortaunely I ha made arrn gmen s before the meeting time was changed and I had to l at about five. I gather the women liberation discussion was postpon unt l the next meeting.

Al's report on the press , the general line of which was adopted, is bening presented as the position adopted by the plenum. With regard the journal it is going to say t at we decided to hold off publica of the journal until at least substnatial moves towards the weekly publication of LC and the twice mont ly Liberation have been realize That is not the position spelled out in the press report that the CC members received in their kit upon arrival at the plenum. --it read on page 7 \we are proposing holding off any further publicati obviously the journal, until the moves to t e weekly and biweekly accom lished--specifically postponemen of the theortetical journa until that ti e."

no

what actually was the decision of the plenum--did Al speell out in h
report what they actually say he did--this very open ended formaula.
I would agther not--he carried the line of the Press Report Document.
If he did happen to say what they claim why was this not brought ope
to the attention of the plenum--that there was a modificiation of th
Press report in this respect . Is it a matter of one listening clos
ough remembering correctly. Not at all when there are differences
a movemen it is essn tial that decisions be very clearly stated,
written out and any changes at any stage clearly written down
Now we have the womens liberation document as ammended. At the tine
Jacquie presented her report to the PC and to t e East end branch I
declared that they were not ammendments--in fact it was by no means
clear wht they meant. Fortunately under my pressure Jacquie wrote do
in a seven point form the essence of her report to both the East and
West end branches. What are now presented as ammendments to the
WL report bear n resemblance to ~~the~~ Jacquies seven points of here
speeches. They now clearly state that Every mother---every child is
to b dropped. . This was not as point 6 spelled the ammedment---it
clearly said that it "can be useful as a secondary slogan." So too
with the significance of the abortion campign--the document downgrade
it -dumps it--as Wayne R said is rumoured amongs t our opponents on
U of T. A day before I learned that a comrade at Ryerson had applied
and had gota grant to operate an a peal movement on that cam pus and
then decided to not accept it and turned it back. Lynda was attacked
by Hamilton comrades for make Abortion her key note in her speech in
Hamilton. Both of t ere were not understandable until now we have
the ammendment resolution. These two key changes cannot be accepted
as being ~~x~~ the voted for line at the plenum. The are a clear change
They were no discussed at the plenum and not discussed at the West
and East Toronto brnach d scussions--they are now suddenly appearing
the document. Of course the bureau can at any time suggest ammemdnemt
but the discussion all along-so far , has been on a false plane.
Suppose the bureau actually does presen these ammendments to the
resolut on as the PC's and n t the plen m--suppose it acts differentl
on this than it did on the press fiasco doesn't this whole method
of sli ping from one position to another cause tremendous demoralizati
to the comrades ,set up needless tensions . The ammedments are actuall
spelling out what some comrades snesed but what was denied.

-30-
~~xmxmx~~

Following the PC meet ng I returned to finish up the article that I had
been asked to write for LC on the Old Mole. I decided tht I will not
assume the responsib lity of taking on the Old Mole and the currents in
the LSA who think of it as fraternal or close tous. This leadership
has to take the responsib lity. They may well agree with the article
as it goes over the edito s desk. But under the pressure of comrades wh
~~mex~~ almost certainly will not agree with the article--are they going to
stand up an defended it --or will they start to Waffle and leaf me h l
the bag, not inbetween but outside and under attack of both forces.
This is just the tvpe of article that I must not assume reponsibility f
When John proposed it I accepted. Then thinking it over when talking to
George I expressed my uneasiness along th the abonve line--heard the
claim that other comrades in this massive staff of ours were too busy
along with the argument that it needed a public represen ative like cha
to put his name to it. After the PC meeting I realize that this was all
a mistake--I should never have gone along, even though I was motivated
desire to have a positive relatonship with the leadership. I turn d the
5 pages of worked out notes with the detai ld marked up Old Mole to
George Mo day morning with explanation.

Letter to PC

Memorandum II on Labor Challenge

Back on August 14, with the publication of the BC election special of Labor Challenge, I wrote a memorandum to the Political Ccmmittee. It was an expression of unease, of alarm, designed to alert our leadership to what I saw as a developing political problem. I expressed the opinion that by a series of acts of omission that issue of our press "marked a reversal of the line that the LSA/LSO has carried since the adoption at its 1968 convention of the document on Canada-US relations." I quoted from that resolution some sections that clearly defined our attitude to the anti-US imperialist sentiment in this country.

In their reply to my memorandum comrades Henderson and Fidler presented my arguement in a three point form. Point one "acknowledge(d) that the supplement would have been strengthened if it had said more about the role of specifically U.S. capital in B.C., particularly in the article on the 'resources ripoff' (apparently the main target of comrade Dowson's criticism.)"

Comrades Henderson and Fidler summarized me as saying in point two "that the editors consciously avoided almost all reference to U.S. imperialism." In their argument they added that "it is simply not true that we edited out references to the role of U.S. capital." I can readily understand how comrades Henderson and Fidler construed my comment to mean that they had "edited out" material. It turns out that material that I thought essential was not in the copy as it came to the editors desk -- so it was not edited out. The editors neglected to put it in. This process of course does not effect the results, what came to the readers of our press which was my concern. However it happened, it was the omissions that in my opinion constitute a change in line.

Comrades Henderson and Fidler's next paragraph notes that on the class question the supplement stands up quite well. I, of course, entirely agree. They add, however, that by so doing "it projects an effective alternative to not only the traditional reformist leadership but alsothose who would substitute a so-called national independence struggle for a class struggle strategy oriented around the NDP."

I assume that the latter comment refers to those who subsequently split from the NDP to launch MISC. Thus this paragraph does not answer my point that the line of our movement, which is not "national independence" has been ommitted -- a line which considers the anti-U.S. imperialist sentiment as having an essentially radical character -- developing towards an anti-capitalist consciousness, that is now becoming an integral part of and a stimulent to the developing class consciousness of the Canadian working class.

I would point out that I did not say that the line of our movement has been 'changed' through the omission of a theme from a single issue of Labor Challenge". My letter said this issue (the supplement) marked the change. I have been expressing uneasiness about several issues and with the appearance of this one felt called upon to speak out at some official level of the movement -- to the leadership itself -- the Political Committee. I assume that this is not only the right but the responsibility of all members of the LSA/LSO.

In my opinion it is not proper to respond to my expression of unease with the statement that it "can only create unfounded (my emphasis) among leading comrades across the country" and thus "serve to divert the discussion now being conducted in our ranks, and in no way contributes to clarity around the issues being discussed."

That is just theproblem. We are not discussing this matter for reasons about which the entire movement has been very patient. In the light of this repponse I decided to say no more on any official level of the movement -- until now.

I now speak out once again because I think that it is now crystal clear that what we saw in the August, 1972 supplement -- the failure to apply our line adopted in convention by omission, has continued to take place with every issue since then, up to and including the latest issue October 23 and without any discussion and without any explanation on the leading body of the movement.

In fact the very next issue of Labor Challenge, the 8 pages that wrapped around the supplement in question to make up the full August 21 issue, continued what I brought to the PC's attention -- to omit taking up the question of Canada-US relations -- on this occasion in a most peculiar 58 line item which I immediately brought to the attention of the editors. NDP leader David Lewis made a speech to the Miami convention of the Meat Cutters Union. According to a report in the Star his speech in some scope (in fact that is all they reported) appealed to the largely U.S. unionists to recognize what he called a new Canadian nationalism that was becoming widespread amongst Canadian members of the union, one of the longstanding bases of the NDP, and to support the concept of Canadian autonomy within the international. The editors were fully acquainted with the Star report, however, they handled this significant speech by writing up in 58 lines a "speech Lewis did not make." That article outlines a whole series of things that the editors think Lewis should have said on many matters but not one word about what he actually did say on a vital issue in the Canadian trade union movement and involving Canada-US relations.

With the appearance of the next issue, the September 11 issue, I protested to individuals on the editorial staff about the lead front page article on the announcement of the federal elections and the issues as we saw them. There was nothing about the question of Canada-US relations -- the anti-US imperialist sentiment which we declared in the 1968 document "is an important fact of Canadian political and social life," and which everyone knows has become much more so since 1968.

This was conceded and I was assured that we would take this up in the next issue. However, the September 25 issue appeared and the lead editorial on the elections -- by omitting any mention of the anti-US imperialist sentiment, in effect said quite the opposite to what we had said in 1968 -- by omission Labor Challenge said it was a non-issue.

The October 23 issue came out after the NDP launched the second phase of its federal campaign which took its attack on the corporate welfare bums onto the anti-US imperialist sentiment phase. Although Labor Challenge has followed all the major aspects of the NDP campaign we reported not one word of any NDPer on this question nor did we make any comments of our own either in the October 9 or 23 issues.

It is the norm in a Bolshevik organization for its press to expound the line that was last officially established. If developments have taken place of such character as to throw this line into gravest question they must be discussed and the policy of our press, which is our public voice must be worked out -- if only on an interim basis.

It would seem to us that the editorial board, which is a sub committee of this body, by omitting to deal with Canada-U.S. relations over the whole last period in the spirit of our 1968 resolution, has been telling us that the 1968 line is inoperative. The only statement the plenum adopted was on to the effect that we oppose bourgeois aationalism -- which they appear to be telling us is also inoperative. What are we to do. I think that on such a matter we cannot remain silent. Labor Challenge's silence is a political act of a most declamatory character capable of any and every interpertation, first and foremost that the 1968 position is wrong or inoperative. Ther are many ways we could proceed. What we need to do is face the situation, discuss it and make some conscious decisions.

Ross Dowson

October 29,1972.

National Archives CD "J-K" transcription JD

Ross Dowson – 1972 LSA/LSO Plenum, Political Report

Art Y. *(Président de l'assemblée*) Alors nous passons au premier item sur l'ordre du jour, le rapport politique.

RD: Well comrades normally one might consider this to be the most important report before the Plenum and therefore it would be required to be a well prepared report, incisive, inspiring, giving directions, etc. However I must apologize to the comrades; we are not able to meet our own desires to present the Plenum with a rounded and even a written Political Report. As comrades know we are coming into the convention; we are only a couple of months away from the pre-convention discussion, and we had anticipated that we would have a wealth of documentation for the convention at this Plenum. However a series of other events have taken place and overwhelmed this process. As a matter of fact, perhaps the most important challenge before the Plenum at this time is another question, which has just arisen, and that is a very serious attempt on the part of the leadership to restructure the leadership of the movement in preparation for the coming convention.

That has partly overwhelmed some of the political work which will have to be taken up – after the Plenum. Now prior to the Plenum the Political Committee had a series of discussions on the documentary preparations for the convention – a lengthy discussion on what we wanted to have for this coming convention – what was the big challenge before the movement at this coming convention. What does the Trotskyist movement need so that it can head competently and boldly into the struggles and opportunities immediately ahead.

Well, as most of us are well aware, our movement – the youth and the League – has in the last two years displayed itself as an effective gathering of serious revolutionaries who are leading activists in the radicalization process in all fronts in this country. We are, I think we can say, the most effective organizers, have the clearest and most incisive ideas on all the immediate aspects of the struggle – women's liberation struggle, the anti-war struggle, the student struggles, to the indépendantiste struggles; but we do not have readily available one document that, as they say, pulls it all together, that pronounces in a clear and incisive way, our general view of the total challenge before the Canadian revolution, before the Canadian working people.

We have adopted over the last several years a series of documents which are extremely important, and we now have a body of material which I think most of the comrades have found extremely useful – I think we have a good idea where we are going – you might say, however, in parts – for instance, in the 1966 convention I think we adopted "The Power and Dilemma of the Trade Unions," which is a very rounded document on our attitude to the trade union movement, our understanding of the challenges before the militants in the union movement, and the place of the union struggles in the developing revolution. And we adopted I think about two years later the

document “Canada-US Relations” – I think it’s a more important document than we thought at the time when we adopted it – a document that dealt with what’s called “Canadian nationalism” in considerable detail and in a very rounded way. As a matter of fact I was preparing some talks on this question and I found that that document answered all the questions that are still being posed in the Waffle and the new radicalization on a broad scale – we adopted that in ’68.

In ’66 we adopted the document “Vive le Québec Libre” where we started to approach the challenge of the rising indépendantiste spirit that was sweeping across the Québécois, and then in 1970 we adopted ‘’For an Independent and Socialist Quebec.’’ We adopted at another congress – I think we adopted it at a convention – a brief that we had prepared for a Canadian government commission on The Status of Women.

So you see we have a series of documents that deal with various areas – the key areas of the radicalization. But I think we are all aware that this material has to be brought together and to give to our supporters, those workers who are moving in action, the students, the women’s liberation activists, a total picture of what we see as the whole direction; and so we came to the conclusion at this convention that we needed a Political Resolution, not strictly a conjunctural resolution, but a resolution which was an overview. That’s generally what we said we wanted to do.

So we’re working on it, but comrades should appreciate that it’s a very big project. As a matter of fact I am just getting a feel of it now, and it’s going to be a very comprehensive work – it’s going to be extremely valuable but it’s going to take some little time to prepare. We’re going to have it in time for convention, but we’re not going to have it for another couple of weeks, maybe another month, it seems to me, before we have this worked out.

But I’d like to give a sort of feeling for what the challenges of this document are, and then while I haven’t written it and therefore one doesn’t know what are the contentious questions within our own ranks, I took a little time out and skipped part of the process, and tried to deal with what I think may be some of the contentious questions that we are dealing with in this document, so that the comrades could in some way participate in the process of the preparation of the document. As I say, it would be better if the document was here and the comrades could study it, examine it, and concretely come to grips with it.

But I have tried to make a bit of a synthesis of some aspects of it, which I think may be contentious in our ranks, and in which we can all participate and bring a clarification during the Plenum and I hope, after the Plenum – that there is some correspondence on some aspects of the questions. So here’s how, roughly, I see the document: We want to deal with what is Canada, what’s its place in the world, and what’s its special relations with the US military machine and financial oligarchy. We want to deal with the question of whether Canada is a colony, or is it a developed capitalist society; we want to deal with Canada and the national question – the two aspects of the national question: Canada as an imperialized and an imperialist nation, an

exploiter of a nation within its own borders, Quebec, and an exploiter of external colonial peoples, particularly the West Indies. We want to deal particularly with Quebec nationalism, the indépendantiste struggle and its revolutionary and socialist dynamic; we want to deal with the language question and its relation to the overall struggle for Quebec independence. We want to clearly and more precisely define the Parti Québécois and the meaning and immediacy of the demand for a labor party in Quebec. Then we want to make a detailed analysis of the class structure in Canadian society, and class antagonisms in Canadian society. We want to deal with the farm question, which we have never really dealt with to any extent, to deal with with the working class, what's happening in the working class, the structure of the working class; we want to take up the union movement, and the NDP, and the new radicalization – we want an extensive evaluation of the new radicalization… *(tape fades out)*

(New tape) So, we want to deal with the Waffle, and the relationship of the revolutionary vanguard cadre to this broad left current that has developed within the New Democratic Party. We want to deal with the problem, and the question, of building the cadre, on the way to building a vanguard party. We want to deal with the path to power in this country, the question of parliamentarism, the parliamentary road, which of course is a common concept, which the NDP and the Communist Party project; we want to outline in a broad way what the revolutionary road is; we want to deal with the mobilization and co-ordination and direction of all the radicalizing forces towards the establishment of workers' power. So that's just a general sketch of it – so it's a panoramic document as you can see – I have never read such a document as this *(RD laughs)*… however… we're going to write such a document for this coming convention, and it's going to be a very big project for us, but I think it is going to be an extremely rewarding project.

As I say we have much of the basic materials for this in the various positions we have adopted on various aspects of the questions; but we know there are some gaps, and there is a very important lack of synthesis of them, bringing them together and giving a qualitatively different character to them – in essence we're writing the program of the Canadian socialist revolution, with certain conjunctural aspects to it, but generally an overview. So that's why we haven't got it.

Now I did take a little time to try to pull out a few of what I would think – there may be many more – of what I think may be some of the contentious questions. And I would hope that comrades might say something on these questions during the discussion, or on any other question which they think might be overlooked or might not be comprehended by the drafters of the document.

I think one of the big challenges for our movement to come to grips with, is what is called "Canadian nationalism," with what we have said is an anti-imperialist sentiment; and with what we have, to come degree, somewhat formalistically, counterposed to "internationalism." I took occasion to read through the document that we adopted at our 1968 congress, and I think that certain aspects of this document have not been assimilated by our movement, and certain problems that were posed in that document have not really been answered by our movement yet.

For instance, we said that to call this phenomena "Canadian nationalism" – to call it "nationalism," is not only to designate it incorrectly, it leads to a dismissal if not an opposition to it. However, we also of course said very very clearly in this document that we considered this (phenomenon) to be one of the main sources of radicalization of the Canadian working people as a whole, and we said it is a fundamental task for us to identify ourselves with it, to intervene in the developing struggles around it.

We went on to say "not only is it an anti-imperialist sentiment developing towards anti-capitalist consciousness." but "it is essentially anti-imperialist and finds no basis of support in any sectors of the Canadian capitalist class and its spokesmen, who defend US imperialism, not only with a natural affinity, but with a clear understanding that their fate is inextricably tied to that of the US ruling class." That terminological reservation we put in our document on it to be a misnomer, I think has caused us not to fully grasp the question, since we didn't find the "name" of the phenomenon, and had some reservations with identifying ourselves with a phenomenon which is called "Canadian nationalism," although the document is permeated with the idea that we should identify ourselves with it completely, but because of this hesitation, our doubts about the "name" of it, it seems to me, and possible misunderstanding of it, we haven't, in my opinion, come to grips with this question. It's not clear in our press; it's not clear in any of our propaganda; in the student milieu, in any area; we have not translated this in an effective way it seems to me – our identity with it.

However, we were not caught cold when this phenomena came onto the scene in the biggest and grandest scale – I am referring to the Amchitka struggles *(see Home Page: "How Canada can break from the US empire.")* In our opinion, (at our conference that took place) just after the Amchitka actions which we involved ourselves in on a very big scale, we had an Ontario educational conference here in Toronto, and I gave a speech on Canadian nationalism and Amchitka, and I ripped aside, ripped away, the term Canadian nationalism – or I no longer put the reservation around it that it was an anti-imperialist sentiment, and attempted to identify our movement with this phenomena completely and absolutely, and it caused some unease among the comrades – some considerable unease among the comrades when I did this.

We did move into the action, which was the biggest, most broad anti-imperialist action that's taken place in this country – the Amchitka protest – so we were more or less prepared for it, but we hadn't assimilated it fully and hadn't overcome certain reservations that we had about this. I think this question has to be come to grips with very openly in the document, and we should no longer hesitate to completely identify ourselves with "Canadian nationalism."

I think we need to deal in this document with some detail with the question of the language struggle, its importance in the indépendantiste struggle as a whole, and we have to give a more precise analysis of the Parti Québécois – I know we have written some documents, we have a position, but this is an on-going challenge before the Left – to continue to interpret this movement and to give an analysis of this movement – I know

this is, from my own experience, and I am sure it is a challenge for the comrades in Quebec. You can't talk to any radicals who have any understanding or any identity with the Quebec struggle without feeling that the PQ is a key question, which we have to firmly come to grips with, in a clear analysis. I think we have to do this, again and more profoundly, in this document, and we have to find a relationship and how we can present the concept of a labor party in this struggle, in this political development of the Québécois, which the PQ represents – the political development of the indépendantiste struggle, but a non-proletarian party.

I think we have to deal with the radicalization process in a more precise way than we have, rather than just descriptive, and an identification with it; I think we have to come to grips with this concept which permeates our documents and our speeches, the concept that this struggle – these struggles in their individual parts and in their totality – are anti-capitalist, and are revolutionary – and developing in the anti-capitalist struggle.

I think we have to declare in a very clear way that these struggles have their own legitimate purposes and legitimate aims, and they`re not to be weighed with regards to their own legitimacy in relation to some other struggle – for instance with regards to the working-class struggle. They have their own aims, their own program and their own demands, their own dynamic and their own part in the overall radicalization of the masses in this country.

And it seems clear to me we have to establish a revolutionary **socialist** critique of Waffle. It is no longer adequate for our movement to identify itself with Waffle, to see the development of Waffle as an affirmation of our analysis of the NDP, and to participate in Waffle and to criticize various aspects of its program, but we have to make a revolutionary socialist critique of Waffle to establish our relations as the nucleus of the revolutionary vanguard, in a very open and clear and incisive way, to Waffle. Above all we have to define Waffle in relation to the League for Socialist Action and the Ligue Socialiste Ouvrière, and to the Young Socialists and the LJS. We have to define it as a reformist current, and to define the LSA-LSO as the nucleus of the revolutionary vanguard party; and this discussion is taking place in the NDP left wing.

So as I say, I don`t think by any means that this – my few comments – (does more than to) open up the door for a broad discussion . I think that the document of the tendency which has been circulated to the comrades, the document called "Peripheral Movements" expresses in perhaps the most false but clear way an incorrect attitude towards these radicalization processes in their various parts. The document of the United Tendency on the "Peripheral Movements" questions the legitimacy of the student struggles. Not only does it challenge the student aspect – that there is a program for the student struggle, that it is possible to develop a transitional program for the student struggle, but it gives no credibility and no significance to the student struggle in itself – sees it completely only as a detonator or as an initiator, but gives no legitimacy to the struggle itself. And I think we need to establish very clearly, in the student milieu and in all these movements, which are not "peripheral" in any meaning of the word, but are part of the total struggle, the increasing radicalization of the masses of this country. And I

think we have to put this, as I tried to say in my preliminary comments on one aspect of the document, within the framework of the mobilization of the Canadian masses, of which the industrial proletariat are the key sector for the seizure of power, but which are only part of the whole radicalization process – even though they may be – they are – the decisive part, the other parts are not in any sense "peripheral" in the sense that their struggles are not relevant, or not an integral part of the whole radicalization processes.

So I hoping that these few comments that I made will be useful for a discussion by some of the comrades here today which I will record, and will be useful in further amplifying certain aspects of the document. I am sure there are whole aspects of the document which I haven't even touched upon.

(end of Dowson report, followed by a 2-hour discussion period)

Summing-up of Ross Dowson report discussion

RD: Well comrades, it is very difficult to summarize a general discussion which many comrades have participated in; it is obvious that I struck the main chords of the problems in my attempts to raise (pause) I struck at the main chords so that comrades could think about them, in my presentation of what I thought were certain problems in general in the movement that we wanted to come to grips with.

For some while some comrades have been talking about the need for a document on the NDP, and I've been uneasy about this document and I can see now why – why we did not want a document on the NDP. I think we do not want to deal with the NDP and Waffle except within the whole process of the radicalization; (such as) this type of document, the document we are now talking about, that puts it in a certain framework. I think our relationship to the NDP and to the Waffle can only be grasped within the framework of the whole radicalization process and in the framework of building the cadre of the revolutionary vanguard – that's how it has got to be presented.

Some comrades spent some time on the question of Canadian nationalism, and as I heard some of the comments, particularly Nick's and Stu's, I couldn't help but be struck by the fact that they have been answered in the document. I am just going to say a few words about the document – not that the documents answer everything, but they give partial answers and we have some insight into this. We said "the revolutionary socialists have successfully evaded (avoided) the sectarian danger of broad abstract formulations, etc. that don't make a correct assessment of the actual situation. We did not oppose the movement towards setting up Canadian unions, separate and independent of the so-called 'international' unions, on some abstract principle that we are internationalists and revolutionaries, and this is nationalist and reactionary. We considered that the support that this had among militants was largely a reaction against the undemocratic manipulations of the trade union bureaucracy. We expressed our sympathy with this, and to those who would listen, we cautioned that bureaucracy was endemic to reformist unions in our epoch." Now of course I would say… *(interpreters interject)*

Yes, of course I was reading, so I will have to slow down. Now, we didn't give an exact prescription; but we said you have to be with that feeling among the workers, and not cut across it, and you've got to try to understand what underpins it – what really underpins it. There is really no prescription for that situation… *(tape ends)*

(New tape) Yes, okay, I think the general response to this challenge that met some of our comrades in the union movement, is answered in the need to struggle for Canadian trade union autonomy – not separatism, but autonomy. I think this is the big demand that confronts the Canadian union movement – to fight for the rights of Canadian workers within the union movement, as they are now – and this is the way you fight against the bureaucracy. Now you fight to build a militant rank-and-file operation. I am not sure exactly what Stu is getting at, but there is not going to be any discussion on union work in this Plenum, so I would just like to say a few words about what I sensed he was talking about.

Yes, I think the question of a united Quebec union movement is posed very sharply, if necessary independent and separate from the CLC. However I think it is not exactly posed in the way it might appear to some comrades. You see the Quebec Federation of Labor is not a trade union centre in the real sense of the word. It has no authority, it has no discipline, it has no processes of operation in which the Québécois workers can express themselves as a force within it – it's composed of international unions essentially: the UAW, Steel, etc. – so the fight has to take place for the correct sensitivity of these unions to respond to the Québécois' needs, within the international unions – that's where it has to take place.

I'd just like to say a few words about the Canadian nationalist movement as we know it, and some of the fears expressed by Alain (B, Montreal), that this movement has some reactionary overtones insofar as Quebec is concerned. I do not think that this is true, except in the Committee for an Independent Canada – it's true there. The bourgeois attempts to respond to this – I think this was very clear on – I forget now, we quoted one of them in the press – Ryan, Claude Ryan – made it very clear in his statement. He said "we have nothing to talk about in Quebec,'' you see, people like ours, the editor of Le Devoir – this is a real problem, you see, we don't have this phenomenon of Canadian nationalism – he didn't want to identify himself with the indépendantiste movement, but I think when you talk about this movement insofar as it is a viable current of the radicalization process, and which we are working in, that's what you want to talk about – it is pro-Quebec, it identifies itself with the Quebec independentist movement – and that was behind the big success of the Chartrand tour *(Michel Chatrand, militant veteran unionist jailed in 1970 during the WMA, Vanguard pamphlet "Free Quebec political prisoners")* – it's identified with, and as you know Waffle – of all the positions that Waffle took at various times – its Quebec position was the most correct one, and the most precise position in identity with our position.

Yes, I think that Waffle does present us with a challenge on a different plane than it did – I am not sure that I suggested that Waffle is a hard current as Dick translated that. I think it has many of these elements. I don't think we can say where Waffle is going, and

I don't think we need to be prophesizers of where it is going. I don't think we have to make prophesies either about the PQ and whether independence can be realized in Quebec within a bourgeois framework – I think it's irrelevant; I don't think we can exclude that – I don't think it bothers us at all – whether Quebec can establish some form of independence via the PQ within the bourgeois framework – I think it's quite possible it can. Well, someone even says ''probable,'' however this only presents the challenge in its most real and profound character: is this ''independence'' of any validity or of any meaning, this ''independence'' which is more tied in and clued in with American imperialist investment, à la Parizeau – nobody is going to take that very seriously once they start to come to grips with the reality of it. So it presents the socialist projection.

Unfortunately (…) I wasn't able to record many of the questions that comrades have put forward, but I have taken considerable note of them. I thought that the comments by Gary, and Dick picked them up, on the new working class, you might say, are very important for us to deal with. I think that bourgeois society is more vulnerable than it's ever been in any period of it's history, and to present its vulnerability as being completely in the hands of the classical industrial proletariat is quite wrong – I think what some persons have called the ''petit-bourgeois'' workers, the professional workers, the workers who are now becoming radicalized – the school teachers and the technicians of various characters – they are now in many senses now in a much more strategic position than the heavy industry working class, because of the increasing vulnerability of capitalism.

I'm glad we have tapes of what was spoken; I thought the comments were extremely valuable that comrades put forward and I hope that while we didn't have time to have comrades make a second round contribution, that they will make these contributions and send them in a letter form and we will attempt to assimilate them – I didn't sense any problems or any contradictions in any of the contributions that the comrades made and I think that we have a very clear idea of what the line of this document is, and that we will be able to formulate it to the satisfaction of all the comrades – and of course to their edification.

(Dowson sum-up ends; the Report is adopted by a vote conducted by the Chairman. The Dowson collaborative Political Report never saw the light of day --ed.)

Original file: RDW-NA-CD-M National Archives CD "M" transcription JD

Ross Dowson – 1972 LSA/LSO Plenum – Crescent Report (Publications)

You see, a report on Crescent publications can go many ways… I was going to say something (along the lines) of what John (R.) was saying, that generally our movement is over-activist-oriented, and doesn't dedicate enough time and energy to the necessary administrative work, which Crescent is a very essential part of.

For long years when our movement didn't have a paper, and it had no publications, it had an open bookstore and sold other people's publications, to scrape together the rent, to finance the circulation of other people's publications. But now we are in a very good situation and are able to use the publications financed by others, (containing) our ideas, and we haven't taken advantage of that in a very full way.

For instance I don't see how we can hope to intervene with any effectiveness in the youth radicalization without really using Pathfinder Books *(the Socialist Workers Party, New York, publishing house),* and we do in a very very modest way. We put up literature stands in many many places – I suddenly found one in here, inserted itself into our Plenum here, surreptitiously – but I think that we have not taken seriously a big opportunity that is open to us by using other people's bookstores, other people's facilities, even the books that are ripped off, they have to pay for them, you know *(laughs from plenum),* so that the whole thing is a very big favorable opportunity for us to move in with materials that other sections of the world movement have provided for us.

Now comrades should know from the energy that has been put in by our movement to put out the few publications that we have, you have a rough idea of what our American comrades have done to get Pathfinder on the road, to get going. Well, we have a big advantage here, where they have done the work. But we also have a responsibility, of course, because the work of the revolutionary movement on the North American continent has to be handled, and looked upon as a totality, of developing the market of English-reading material. It's a responsibility – it's an opportunity for us. And we haven't allocated nearly enough time and energy either at the centre or at the periphery *(laughs from the plenum)* to do this – to do this work. As a matter of fact, what it is challenging now, for us to do, is to start a serious, a really serious publication effort of our own, and the only place where we've done that is in Montreal *(with a dozen Éditions d'Avant-garde and other pamphlets, with nine more planned, as Alain B. reports –ed.)* The comrades in the LSO have carried out a really extensive publication program and they've used the money of the central office because they've been more initiating; its money that belongs to the common movement, but they've used it. The English-speaking sector of the movement hasn't used the resources that we have had difficulty scraping together, but what we have scraped together. We've done it – when the comrades in Montreal demanded it, we said yes, and we found the dough – small amounts on the basis of their publication program; but they have an extremely elaborate and effective publication program; and in the English language we have not done this. And yet we have

a big challenge and a big opportunity. In the English language we have an even bigger opportunity.

For the comrades in Montreal, their publications cannot be circulated in any meaningful way; in English Canada – we now are the biggest agency, we are the only important agency of radical books in Canada. We have **all** the radical publications. There`s nobody else who has any worth a damn. From a commercial point of view, from a publicity point of view, from any view, we have them all. And we have this distributing agency which we`re not really working, and this distributing agency can be put at our service because of course we`ve tied in, on a modest scale, what Vanguard publications there are, in with the Pathfinder, in with Merlin, in with New Left Books, with them all; so we have one sheet of publications which are undifferentiated; but the most interesting ones of course, it seems to me, are the ones on Canada. Since we`re in Canada and for anybody who is concerned, I think we now have a vehicle to make it well worth while – not only necessary – but well worth while for us to devote a great deal of energy now in a publications way.

Any publication that we put out now can get a circulation – its guaranteed a circulation, of I would say a thousand or so, its absolutely guaranteed. We should all start to become authors; I assume anything we are going to write in the next period that is of any value or any importance, we`re going to put it out as a publication quickly. As a matter of fact just a year ago, and comrades outside the centre don`t know this, but about a year ago, maybe even less, we had an opportunity, thanks to a federal government grant, to respond to an appeal to submit titles to an all-Canadian list of current books, published and printed – it was Canadian nationalism, you see – books that were authored, published and printed in Canada. Somebody got a big grant to do this, and we fastened in on it – we happened to be in the Canadian publications business – and we heard about this publication going out, and we submitted the names of all our publications. I phonied authors to them. We put on the LSA women`s brief, I think we put Joan Newbigging as the author (…) we put Dick (F.) as the author of another; but we had a lot of documents which were party documents. We gave individual author`s names to them and put them into the hopper as publications of a commercial character, and we`re getting a response from that.

That catalogue of Canadian publications went throughout the world – 400,000 copies? Some incredible number of copies of that catalogue was published and we`re now getting orders across Canada from this catalogue, which is in every public library and every university library and at every book agent and every bookstore –it`s everywhere, and its got our publications listed in it. So its very important – this whole area is – we have not devoted enough time and energy to it. There are unlimited possibilities – you can talk about it and **do** something about it in almost every area – real opportunities.

Now I think the comrades should know that. We have all the publications agencies that one would want, and we can carry our literature and we're going to carry Pathfinder in an area where it`s never been before. Pathfinder is going to be lifted by all

the other more established, more accepted publications of the Left. And our publications, as the League and Vanguard publications are going to be carried too. We have to respond to that.

(contribution ends)

League for Socialist Action/ Ligue Socialiste Ouvrière

Discussion Bulletin 1972

Contents

DOCUMENTS ON THE O -D APPEAL
--submitted by the Political Committee

1. Political Committee Motion, August 31, 1971
2. Appeal by M. Mill, et al., to the United Secretariat, Sept 16, 1971
3. Letter from Ernest Mandel to Ross Dowson, Sept. 29, 1971
4. Statement of Will O and Walter D to the Political Committee, Oct. 10, 1971
5. Letter of Ross Dowson to Walter D and Will O , Oct. 26, 1971
6. Reply by the Political Committee to the Mill Appeal to the United Secretariat, Oct. 30, 1971 (& R D -ed.)
7. Report by the Political Committee on the Maritimes suspensions
8. Findings of the Political Committee, Nov. 15, 1971
9. Letter of the United Secretariat to M. Mill, Jan 22, 1972
10. Appeal of Will O and Walter D to the Central Committee Plenum of March 31, and April 1-2, 1972
11. Plenum Decision on the O -D Appeal
12. Appeal of Walter D and Will O to the Convention

APPENDIX: Correspondence, listed in item 12.

Number 15 Price: $1.50

November, 1972

For Internal Circulation Only

5. LETTER FROM ROSS DOWSON TO WALTER D. AND WILL O. OCTOBER 26, 1971

Dear Comrades,

At its meeting of October 17 the Political Committee passed the following motions relevant to you.

"M/c that the investigation including all taped testimonials and replies of the four comrades, (Terry H.S., Carol W., Will O., and Walter D.) sustains the evidence particularly with regards to the Halifax and Fredericton conferences and indirectly the evidence related to the minutes.

"M/c that the four Maritimers be reinstated and that the Political Bureau draw up a statement of censure of the four comrades to be submitted to the Political Committee's next meeting for ratification."

I have been delayed in sending you this information as I had hoped to send you the statement at the same time -- but the pressure of other work has delayed this. I will now send this separately just as soon as possible.

Comradely,

Ross D.

6. REPLY BY THE POLITICAL COMMITTEE TO THE MILL APPEAL

The following statement to the United Secretariat was adopted on October 30, 1971 by the LSA/LSO Political Committee.

Toronto
October 30, 1971

These comments are in response to the request of the United Secretariat for our views on an appeal that it investigate the situation in the Canadian section and make the interventions it thinks necessary. The appeal is signed by the four members of the Montreal tendency, by G. R , alleged to have been expelled recently, and four LSA/LSOers in the Maritimes, suspended August 31 but reinstated on October 17.

We first wish to note that despite the fact that this appeal is dated September 16 and marked "carbon copies sent to the Political Committee LSA/LSO and the National Committee LSO", we only became acquainted with it on October 15 thanks to receipt of a copy from the United Secretariat.

Comrade Mill is a member of the Central Committee of the LSA/LSO and comrade L is a member of the Executive Council of the YS/LJS. The four Maritimes comrades participated in extensive hearings conducted by the Political Committee through two of its leading members over the October 9-11 weekend. Yet the leading bodies of the Canadian movement have at no time received any appeal of any type from either Mill or Leroux relevant to any of the matters now taken to the United Secretariat, nor was the Political Committee subcommittee informed in any way by the Maritimes comrades of their appeal or its character, although it would seem to be relevant to its inquiry.

We think this procedure, which completely bypasses, ignores, all the organizational forms of the Canadian section to hit right into the United Secretariat, is most unusual to say the least and makes it unnecessarily difficult for such a body to get a clear and balanced picture of the situation.

We would like to assure the United Secretariat that we heartily concur with comrade Mandel's exhortation that it is especially in a period of pre-world congress discussion when all sections' leaderships should bend over backwards to insure minority rights in their section and in the International. We believe that the Canadian section has a spotless record in this respect and that, as this incident will show, even upon the most cursory investigation, our record will continue to remain without a blemish.

Nonetheless we must record our objection to comrade Mandel's observation that the similarity of the allegations made by the Canadian minority against the Canadian leadership and by the British minority against the IMG leadership as to restriction of democratic minority rights is very striking. We question what purpose is served by such comments.

We hope that you do not think it necessary for us to answer all the allegations in the September 16 appeal. We hope that any uneasiness

that may have been caused by the unilateral September 16 appeal will be satisfactorily met by our comments on a few of them.

But before we comment on perhaps the more significant allegations in the appeal we would point our that many of them such as the comment "some of the members of the majority leadership demanded several times that they (Montreal tendency and Maritime members) present their differences in public" and the comment "scarcely veiled threats of suspension... by several comrades of the Montreal majority leadership" can only be considered unsubstantiated rumour and gossip.

First we must say that we are surprised by the paragraph which brings into question the procedures of our last convention. We recall that both comrades Krivine and Beauvais attended that convention and comrade Krivine reported to the United Secretariat his complete satisfaction with the procedures of that convention, particularly, as we recall, in relation to the rights of the tendency.

One of the features of this convention was its complete bilingual character through a similtaneous translation system. Not only did the tendency with its single delegate have equal time on every report and full representation on all bodies including the praesidium (through tendency supporters who did not qualify as delegates) but facilities of the convention were extended beyond all normal limits to make all minority documents available even though they arrived much later than the deadline. The executive secretary himself missed part of the convention to see to it personally that a last-minute document was circulated. A couple were retranslated and re-run after the convention and circulated throughout the League, unanswered to this day despite their highly contentious character.

It strikes us as odd to see that the authority of the control commission, which was not elected at that convention through oversight, is brought into question at this date when the previous one was confirmed in office without the slightest sign of dissent from anyone, including the minority representative on the Central Committee at the plenary session following the adjournment of the convention. Why the three-person commission happens to be composed only of majority comrades is clear -- what isn't clear is why this matter is raised to the attention of the United Secretariat.

There seems to us to be no substantial evidence of a "witch-hunt"-- of a "dissident-hunting" atmosphere -- in the Canadian section as alleged by those making the appeal.

For instance -- the case of Gilbert R of Chibougamau. Comrade R was not expelled as the appeal claims but rather dropped from membership without political prejudice, by a procedure normal in all LSA/LSO branches. Article III, Section I of the LSA/LSO constitution specifies that all members must engage in the League's work. Article VII, Section I defines monthly dues of all members as 50 cents, and Article VII, Section 5 states that "members six months in arrears (in payment of dues) shall be stricken from the rolls".

By August last R was eight months in arrears in payment of dues. Further, he had had no contact with the Montreal centre since April and had not responded to any correspondence. R

was informed by the national organizer when he was passing through Montreal that if he did not pay up his dues in two weeks he would be dropped from membership. Three weeks later when it was reported that he had not paid dues, the National Committee dropped him from membership without prejudice.

Is it in any way "a warning to the entire minority"? If it is, the message would appear to be a very simple one that no loyal member could take exception to -- it is to tell them that the constitution of the League is to be respected by them as by all other members of the League and that they should meet minimal financial obligations to the movement as required by the constitution.

As for what is an even more serious charge in our opinion -- that the minority "has gradually been relieved of all its work areas". This seems to appear in the appeal almost in passing, with no particulars and no examples cited. It seems to us impossible to believe that the appeal is referring to the "Argentine affair", known in the Canadian section as the "Liberation boycott", but apparently it does. This incidently involved more than two comrades of the Montreal LJS but the entire minority including comrade Mill. This matter is documented in the Statements and Reports of the Summer 1971 Plenum of the LSA/LSO.

On June 13 the minority tendency stated that it was boycotting the French language organ of the LSA/LSO -- a boycott which covered writing for it, helping produce it, sell it, or doing any routine work related to it in any way.

It is our opinion that the boycott of the press of a section is a violation of the most elementary discipline and a repudiation of the movement itself and constitutes a terrible provocation of the leadership of a section. The minority attempted to justify its boycott by transcending its responsibilities to the section in which it holds membership. It cloaked its boycott of the press of the Canadian section with the authority of the Fourth International itself. It declared that it would continue its boycott until it had consulted with the United Secretariat of the Fourth International.

It was when comrade Mill stated to the plenum that he never got a reply from the United Secretariat -- not an official one, that comrade Dowson wrote his letter of September 7 asking comrade Mandel if he could throw any light on this matter.

The appeal now before the United Secretariat for consideration states that the minority's final resignation from the editorial board of Liberation should have served to "prevent the leadership of the YS/LJS from censuring the boycotters." -- as if the resignations made the boycotts excusable. The Central Committee of the LSA/LSO in its plenary session endorsed the action of the Quebec National Committee "to drop comrade Michel Mill from the editorial board of Liberation as a statement of our view of his resignation from the editorial board".

And far from relieving them from this area of work, as the Canadian leadership has been alleged to have been systematically doing, an area of work which they themselves first boycotted and then resigned from, it instructed "the minority tendency to commence loyal and consistent work to support and circulate our publications."

From the appeal one would conclude that disciplinary actions of a far-reaching character are taking place right across the Canadian section -- the appeal refers to "another discipline matter which had nothing to do with the Quebec or the Atlantic provinces." Who it had to do with and with what -- and what the disciplinary action was -- we are not told! We are only told, it is alleged that a leader of the YS/LJS said "We don't need any proof. You must have confidence in the leadership."

It is unfortunate to see this version of what was first alleged by comrade Leroux again repeated in an appeal to the United Secretariat. It would of course be damning if the leadership of the Canadian section held the view attributed to it -- that disciplinary actions can be taken against members of the section without any proof.

But to get to the truth it might first be best to say a few words on what the whole thing is about. The recent youth plenum was called upon to approve of the recent suspension of several Toronto members who had been proven to the satisfaction of almost the entire local to have been violating, despite repeated warnings, the movement's well known and unequivocal ban on the use of illegal drugs. To demand that the plenum hear "proof", hear the evidence, was to demand that the plenum itself hold a trial and render its own verdict, that it annul or reject the trial already held by the Toronto local. The Y S leader referred to said to the satisfaction of almost everyone there, but not, it appears, to the satisfaction of the minority, that "We don't need to hear the evidence" because a trial has already been held where the evidence had already been heard in full and tested in full.

The youth leadership presented a motion asking that the plenum "show confidence in the leadership" by upholding the trial conducted by the Toronto leadership and supported by an overwhelming majority of the Toronto local. All the delegates to the plenum endorsed the action -- except for two supporters of the Montreal tendency. They abstained. Why did they abstain? Because of what they persist in alleging a youth leader said?

With regard to the allegation that an LJS comrade was "forced to sign a public rectification of an article she wrote in a nationalist magazine." If the rectification (correction) dealt "only on the tone of the article and the emphasis put on different aspects of the women's liberation movement in the article" it would have in our opinion also been "a very rigid definition of democratic centralism" (even though the comrades appealing to the United Secretariat think it "formally permissible") -- "to oblige a comrade to be the spokesperson for nuances in the line with which she is not in agreement."

However, more than tone was involved. The headline over the article read "Neither Male Chauvanism nor Feminism" thereby falsifying the position of the LJS and the Canadian section to which the article was attributed. We give complete support to and identification with feminism.

Furthermore, the article contained a regrettable factional attack on a women's liberation group which even worse was based on misrepresentation of its position and a slur that it was linked up to the

terrorist FLQ in its thinking. This had grave immediate consequences for us -- for one thing we were banned from use of the facilities of the main women's centre in Montreal.

The article was contrary in its content to the motion adopted by the women's liberation fraction. The comrade submitted the article without making the changes agreed to in discussion with the comrade who had been struck off to edit the article with her.

Why was this comrade asked to put her name to the correction? Certainly not to humiliate her. To have submitted the correction in the name of the movement, or of a known spokesperson of the movement, would have been a repudiation of the comrade. The correction was a routine presentation of the movement's basic position which was edited for style by the comrade.

One last point which we must comment on -- the suspension of the two LSA/LSO comrades in Halifax and the two in Fredericton by the Political Committee of the LSA/LSO, and the suspension of the Halifax and Fredericton YS/LJS locals (of which they are the leading members) by the CEC of the YS/LJS on August 31 and September 1.

While the action of the PC and the CEC was unusual, the situation was unusual. The PC has just written a lengthy report for circulation through the Canadian section. We will attempt to summarize the salient points.

These actions were certainly not of a factional character as the appeal claims but in defense of the movement. They were of an emergency character, of a temporary nature. Shortly after the plenum, the PC became acquainted with certain information and, in the light of other developments, concluded that it did not know where the four Maritime comrades, who were leaders of the two YS/LJS locals, were headed. It felt that decisions of the gravest implications to the work of the entire movement were being taken behind the back of the movement and that the movement could no longer assume any responsibility for the actions of these comrades.

It called for an immediate investigation. And, so that this could take place with the full authority of the movement and as impartially as possible, it turned the investigation over to the control commission. It was not a trial, with evidence, etc. There were no charges laid. There was to be an investigation - of certain information that had come to the PC's attention. The Fredericton comrades did not reply to any communications from the date of suspension August 31 to September 30, and the Halifax comrades refused to answer the control commission with respect to any of the information that was the basis of its enquiry.

With this defiance of the control commission blocking any investigation, the PC decided to lay a charge of gross disloyalty on September 30 and presented evidence to back up the charge. Without going into all the details, in our opinion, a communication that we finally received from the leading Fredericton comrade endorsed by the Fredericton YS executive after the laying of the charge alone fully justifies the emergency action taken by the PC.

The document is titled "NDP report passed by the YS executive September 28 to be introduced to the YS local October 2." It commences: "For about nine months we have directed our NDP work towards building the Waffle (a loose left formation in Canada's labor party formation -RD) in preparation for a decisive conflict with the right wing. This decisive conflict is underway. It began at the NDP convention Sept. 25 and will end when the convention reconvenes on October 16." The report noted that a leading YS/LJS member took part in writing the Waffle Manifesto, another wrote the women's rights resolution and T. Hamilton-Smith wrote the labor resolution.

This line is a clear violation of our entire orientation to the NDP, not only as outlined by our last convention but redefined at our recent planum, and validates the fears that Comrade Dowson expressed in his correspondence to Terry Hamilton-Smith back in July which went unanswered.

The September 25 convention of the tiny and isolated New Brunswick NDP adopted by a marginal vote a whole series of infantile ultra-left resolutions which resulted in a walk-out of the trade union leadership and a de facto split.

The Political Bureau instructed the editors of Labor Challenge to make a public dissociation of our movement from the ultra-left line of the resolutions and any strategy of decisive conflict at this time with the right wing. This appeared in the Oct. 11 issue of Labor Challenge - Walkout breaks up NDP convention, by P. Kent. October 16 saw the NDP provincial council meet, and with the approval of the federal leadership adjourn after calling for a convention on Nov. 27. The ultra-left went through the motions of electing new officers and thus consummated the split.

While the Fredericton comrades expressed their disagreement with the line expressed in the Kent article, and held to their position outlined in their Sept. 28 YS executive report, they agreed to implement it. At the time of this writing, some two weeks following the split, we have heard no word from the Fredericton comrades about the October 16 developments, either on their role or their opinion ofits significance.

There is substantial evidence that widening circles of the Canadian left believe that the Trotskyists engineered the split in the New Brunswick NDP. The Fredericton Sept. 28 report would tend to substantiate this belief. As this effects our work right across the country, we will be compelled to make further public comments on this development.

Our work in the Maritimes has been severely handicapped, not only by the vast distance separating these comrades from the centre, but by the absence of an experienced Trotskyist cadre there. It has been furthe complicated by the development of what is in effect an undeclared tendency headed by the four League comrades, without clearly defined views, which has encompassed the two Maritime youth locals. We were interested to learn in the appeal to you that the Maritimes comrades "are presently discussing the possibility of forming a united tendency (with the Montreal tendency). . ."

The appeal ends with a summary statement that "in this context serious questions must be posed as to the possibility for us to develop our political positions with a view to a democratic discussion for the next world congress and for the next conventions of the section and the

pan-Canadian youth organization."

We assure you -- these fears are quite groundless. In fact that is just what the Montreal tendency has failed to do -- to make known in a frank and open way as any loyal tendency must do, just what its political views are. See Dowson's report to the Plenum for their views at the time of the last convention. Early this spring the PC opened the internal discussion in the Canddian section. The Montreal tendency has contributed nothing. Comrade Mill's contribution to the plenum following Dowson's report was not handed in in written form. While Mill promised the manuscript within a couple of weeks, it has never arrived at the centre. Finally in order to make it possible for the entire movement to be in some way acquainted with what the views of this tendency are, two months following the plenum -- the central office has transcribed Comrade Mill's speech from the tape of the plenum sessions and sent it to him for any stylistic changes for publication not later than November 14.

We hope that this information deals adequately with the major points raised in the appeal that has been addressed to you. Should you wish information on those points that we have touched upon or material on those that we have skipped over, we would be pleased to supply it.

Comradely,

Ross Dowson
for the Political Committee
of the LSO/LSO

12(b) ROSS DOWSON TO WALTER D. , JULY 28, 1971

Toronto,
July 28, 1971.

Dear Walter:

I have your letter of the 25th before me and a few other items that you have forwarded over the past weeks.

I agree with you that it is a serious matter -- that any editing that it is thought by our Labor Challenge editors necessary must be very scrupulous as to facts. I think you must have misunderstood Jchn. If the paper is factually wrong, what confidence can anyone including ourselves have as to the validity of the theorizing which is presumably based on fact. Of course these errors will, it so happens, be seen by our readers as pure carelessness. But that too is bad. I will make an attempt to work with the comrades to overcome these shortcomings. I am glad that you mention these and hope you will continue to help us maintain a high standard.

Yes, we would very much like to see everything that you have managed to accumulate on Trotsky's stay in Nova Scotia. As I told you on the phone I came across a copy of Queen's Quarterly written by that fellow who wrote Soldiers of the International -- Rodney ? It was a very interesting article and I put some parts of it in an item I wrote on Trotsky and the Canadian revolution that appeared in Labor Challenge or perhaps the Vanguard then -- some two years ago. I was toying with the idea that I would work it up a bit and send it to the International Socialist Review. Perhaps you should think of doing that -- I would be happy to read it over before you send it. It seems to me to be more suited to a magazine than to a paper like Labor Challenge - in a paper it would perhaps lend itself to misunderstanding - personal cultism, etc. I see you are preparing the material in some sort of folio for sale at the Waterloo conference. I will be a certain customer and I am sure there will be many others. I hope you have an opportunity to check your material out with the Queen's Quarterly article. I would think the public library and certainly the university library would have a copy. Labor Challenge could certainly use a column of say three pages anyway.

hy don't you try the editors out? It would seem to me to make a nice ittle August memorial item.

Art is out today looking for an apartment. I hope he has had time to follow up our editorial meeting. We want an article of some scope on the Canso strike: the closure of the plant. This would seem to be an occasion to write up the entire experience. Have you thought that the LSA should make a public statement on this situation? Possibly the NDP at long last has taken a clear position for public ownership and continued operation -- is that too much to expect? If they have of course it may not be worthwhile to make a public statement of our own -- we could be content with the article in our press.

Kate tells me that she forgot to write you about your enquiries with regards to the last paragraph in her letter of July 18 on Waterloo. We are trying to get a few persons of some academic standing to participate with a contribution that will be highly relevant. V.R. at York is a leading activist in womens liberation I gather in womens studies at York, a scholar on Greek and Latin Culture and we are thinking that she may wish to make a real contribution on the matriarchy. We are also asking W.R. who you know to speak on some aspect of working class history in Canada which is his field of study -- we would publicize him as an academic. So it is very limited -- but desireable from many points of view -- including getting funds from SACs.

Re the problem of our work in the NDP in Nova Scotia and New Brunswick. It may well be that the article that I took up very critically does not at all reflect the conscious policy that is guiding our work there. I was alarmed by a few aspects of the article as it appeared in the Labor Challenge and then was told that I should see what was cut out -- which further surprised me. It is good to hear that you think that the article is out of line and that my fears are quite unfounded. I think that it was correct to bring this matter to your and Terry's attention for, as you know, what happens there can have very big repercussions on our work right across the country. The Waffle development is only really getting underway and the NDP under the impact of the continued radicalization has big significance for us.

You ask -- how far do we go in supporting the NDP at the expense of our revolutionary program? A very difficult question to answer. Our support of the NDP is an essential part of our revolutionary program. The revolutionary party cannot be built without a correct orientation to the NDP, -- even where the NDP at this time for a series of reasons is not a particularly viable operation in the Atlantic provinces. I think the question is posed somewhat incorrectly -- is it not?

If and when the NDP violates the revolutionary program -- then we will expose it, condemn it, possibly completely separate ourselves from it. Of course the NDP being reformist continually violates what you might say are parts of the revolutionary program. We do not hesitate to state our own view, to challenge the leadership, etc. etc. But in this whole past period the violations by the NDP have not been such as to cause us to modify in any substantial way our support of it -- which in many areas is more or less for period uncritical. On Vietnam we criticized, pushed and shoved, and I think along with overall developments were able to shift the party to an essentially correct position, although

it is pretty well kept under wraps.

However, as you say we will be able to have a real discussion at Waterloo. Not only is there a series on the NDP but I intend to make my contribution on this very question -- building the revolutionary vanguard -- the attitude of the early Communist Party to Canadian labor party formations in the 20's and our present day movement to the NDP. Looking forward particularly to Atlantic provinces comrades coming in for this.

A Fredericton comrade has been here, casing the medical schools and I had a talk with him about D.K. I think we have to say that for all D's good will towards us he really doesn't understand what it is all about. His energy, his simple revolutionary drive thrusts him into situations, his simplicity and openness brings him into contact with good types. But our experience is that he is really undisciplined, unreliable. We can work with him; he can help us build our movement. He veers wildly from opportunism to ultra-leftism. For instance you refer to his letter in the local press which puts his job on the line. The challenge is to tie him to the discipline of the movement, to convince him of the need to work on a planned basis with other comrades along specific tactical lines. I personally do not hold too much hope for him becoming a Bolshevik. Therefore I agree with the idea of holding him off. One of the big problems is that he doesn't read. It may well be that he cannot. If we had a strong comrade working right along with him he could make a real contribution. I see you are working with some young people in Moncton not tied with him. Once that group gets on its feet it may well be able to assimilate him. But we have to lay down the law with him -- he can be very disruptive of our work in building a serious democratic centralist movement. He is a type who we will be coming into contact more and more. In many ways a fine type of radical worker. We will have to learn how to work with them, to establish relations sometimes within our movement and at other times outside our movement. If our past experience is still valid I think it is outside our movement in the next period.

Comradely, Ross.

PS--Hope you finally got the film ok and we have been able to keep on schedule to some degree.

(c) ROSS DOWSON TO WALTER D , SEPTEMBER 1, 1971.

September 1, 1971

Dear Walter:

I am enclosing for your information and action a decision by the Political Committee of direct and immediate concern to you and other LSA/LSO members at large in the Atlantic provinces.

I don't think that there should be any difficulty in interpreting this decision. For instance it should be clear that you are not authorized to make any public statements in the name of the league or to take any actions other than those which you know to be in line with agreed policies of our movement such as expounding and defending such policies and circulating and sustaining our press, etc.

For your further information I am enclosing two decisions that the plenary session of our Central Committee passed last week -- on gay liberation and on constituting branches.

On checking up the record of the movement I find that there are only four persons who have been accepted as members at large of the LSA/LSO in the Atlantic provinces. While we will continue to entertain applications of membership at large we are not prepared to constitute any LSA/LSO branches in the immediate period ahead in the Atlantic provinces.

I am anxious to get the above information off to you in the mail. I will write shortly on other matters.

Comradely, Ross.

(g) ROSS DOWSON TO WILL O , OCT. 4, 1971

Dear Comrade:

On August 31 on the basis of information that had come to its attention the Political Committee of the LSA/LSO unanimously decided to suspend comrade Walter D and Will O of Halifax and comrades Terry H and Carol W of Fredericton from all rights of membership in the LSA/LSO and to turn the matter over to the Control Commission.

At the Political Committee meeting of September 30, the Control Commission reported

1) that comrades Terry H and Carol W had not replied to any of the communications that had been forwarded to them from the period September 1 to September 30 and it therefore had no alternative but to turn the whole matter back to the Political Committee. It made no recommendations to the Political Committee.

2) that comrades O and L , while they had communicated with the Control Commission persisted in refusing to answer as to whether there was any validity in the information that the Control Commission had been asked to investigate and that it therefore had no alternative but to turn the matter back to the Political Commiteee. It made no recommendations.

The Political Committee thereupon unanimously decided to lay charges against comrades O , D , Terry H and Carol under section 3 of the constitution Article VIII.

I will communicate full details of the procedure just as soon as possible.

Comradely, Ross Dowson for the Political Committee.

(j) ROSS DOWSON TO WILL O , NOV. 12, 1971

from DB files

Dear comrade Will:

I am surprised that the youth CEC decision to accept Art and Penny into membership of the YS/LJS and their assignment to Halifax has not yet at the time of your writing been transmitted to you. Of course the youth executive secretary has been out of the center for some weeks on a Canada-wide tour. R.T. has been trying to fill in but the past several days have been YS days and as you know he is editor. Probably these adjustments have been taken care of and you may already have the letter. At any rate I will bring the matter to their attention.

Of course the situation is unusual -- this allocation of Art and Penny to the YS -- however it seemed clear to me during my visit that the youth and the campus are the central area of activity for the left and therefore for the Trotskyists. Do I not understand that the three personal Halifax YS local executive is composed of Walter, you and one other comrade?

In many areas across the country now, even where we have a core of comrades who are becoming somewhat aged by formal YS standards, we have found that the radicalization is so concentrated and as yet almost confined to the campus that we have been continuing to focus all our forces into that milieu. This is the situation both in St. Catharines and in Ottawa. In both of these centers we have probably as many comrades as are now in Halifax who hold dual membership in the YS and LSA but whose whole area of activity is the campus and the youth.

As you can see this is a general and somewhat complex problem before the whole movement. We are in the process of discussing this matter. For my own information it might be useful if you jotted me a few lines about the present areas of work of the comrades who hold dual membership. I know of course Ruth is on campus. Are both you and Walter still unemployed? Do you not do considerable propaganda work on Dalhousie. I thought the material you forwarded on Dalhousie complicity was very useful. (As you will see the YS has published it in the latest issue.) Art and Penny will both probably be trying to get jobs on campus. Would you see these notes get around.

Fraternally, Ross Dowson.

(n) ROSS DOWSON TO WILL O. , DEC. 9, 1971

from DB #1

Dear Will:

I have received your letter dated December 7.

I do not know to whom your letter is addressed. Surely that section - "Both contain factional attacks on us; the latter document itself replete with inaccuracies, distortions and factual errors. At no time does it address itself to the points we raised concerning our suspensions" -- is not addressed to me!

The August LSA plenum documents and your appeal to the United Secretariat and the Political Committee's reply are not to my knowledge in any way open for discussion in the youth.

The League has made them available as information to the youth--with the agreement of the leading body of the youth.

You will recall your appeal to the United Secretariat is made in the name of your membership in the Canadian section of the Fourth International. The August plenum documents were adopted by a plenum of the LSA/LSO and are binding on persons who are members of the LSA/LSO.

You say you "are working under the assumption that the youth comrades here will be able to take up all the points raised in the August plenum documents . . . " I do not know what points you could possibly be referring to and why they would be taken up by persons who are members of the youth. These documents were adopted by the plenum of the LSA/LSO which is its authoritative body between conventions. If you have differences with these documents I would suggest that you address yourself to them and forward the material to the Political Committee. No one across the movement has until now even suggested that they had any differences and at this time the Political Committee has not opened

up a period for discussion. Since you are a member of the LSA it is not only your right but your responsibility to inform the Politioal Committee of any differences that you have so that it can decide if it is desirable to open up a discussion. As you know the Political Committee is responsible for the internal life of the movement between conventions, including the circulation of material within the movement.

The YS/LJS has no status with the Fourth International other than through its relations to the Canadian section, the LSA/LSO. In so far as it is the youth movement of the League it is in political solidarity with the political positions of the League -- including, I would take this to mean, the August LSA plenum documents. I do not know that the youth leadership has opened up any discussion on the NDP and those areas covered by the plenum documents or if it is even contemplating doing so. You should ask them. The youth, while in political solidarity with the LSA/LSO is organizationally independent of the LSA/LSO.

I would think that anything relevant to any appeal in the youth that is contained in the LSA/LSO Report on the Maritimes Suspensions and the Findings of the Political Committee would in all probability appear in the youth CEC report and findings on the suspensions, to which comrades in the youth would address themselves.

You write that you "are asking the CEC of the youth to print the League transcript from the hearing in Halifax for the EC delegates to the YS/LJS plenum", and ask me "if there are any problems with this".

Of course, we do not want to in any way prevent you from conducting a full defense. But I think that you should motivate this. The LSA/LSO hearings were fragmentary compared to the YS/LJS hearings. They took place both in Fredericton and in Halifax in a very limited amount of time when you consider that the youth hearings were much more extended. Furthermore you will recall that in the youth hearings you comrades were extremely formal and blocked me as secretary of the LSA/LSO from even defending the acting secretary of the League, John Steele. What function is served by now asking the youth to circulate the League transcript? You do not say so but I assume that you have asked them to print the YS transcript. Is it inadequate in some respect? I think you must motivate this request insofar as the LSA/LSO Political Committee is concerned.

Comradely, Ross Dowson.

(g) ROSS DOWSON TO WALTER D , JAN. 12, 1972

Dear Comrade Walter:

With regards to your request that the League make available to League comrades the appeal that the Halifax local of the YS/LJS made to the recent YS/LJS plenum.

I have brought this to the attention of the Political Bureau of the LSA/LSO. We do not see any reason why the LSA/LSO should take it upon itself to circulate this specific item. I would assume that the basic documentation of the youth plenum will be circulated as usual through the youth and be made available to League members. Should the appeal be amongst those documents it would in the natural course of events be available to League members.

We could see even less reason for the LSA/LSO to circulate this YS/LJS material for as you note you will be submitting your appeal to the

coming convention of the LSA/LSO and there will be some considerable overlap.

Fraternally, Ross Dowson.

Dear Comrades Will and Walter:

With regards to your letter of March 10 that arrived this morning.

The Political Committee is not proposing to the plenum that any time be allocated to the D -O -T tendency. Should you care to send along any material on your viewpoint you canbe sure that it will be circulated through the Central Committee. Since I know of no precedent for such a request as you make, together with the fact that you have submitted no material at all at any level of the movement on your views I would suggest that it would not be adviseable for you to spend the time and money on a trip up here. There are many urgent matters confronting the plenum, the discussion has not yet been opened within the movement and there will be plenty of time when it is, and I would myself feel quite sure that the plenum will not agree to allocating time to the D-O-T- tendency at this time. I will of course place it before them.

On the question of your appeal on the suspensions. It would be convenient if you were able to send us it in writing in advance. How much time do you think you require and what day would you prefer? The plenum is meeting over the period that I mentioned in a letter I sent to you yesterday. I would think that the plenum would be prepared to allocate something in the neighborhood of an hour on that specific aspect of an organizational report we are preparing. If you have a preference as to the day or time of day would you let me know. We are not prepared to meet any expensesthat you might incur in coming to Toronto for this purpose.

It happens to be Kate's day off so I am unable tocheck on your references to being designated as a branch in some financial campaign material. Of course it is a slip up if the Halifax members at large were designated as such -- possibly Halifax was referred to as an area. Glad to hear that you are accepting individual pledges. It looks like the campaign is going to be a real success.

I suppose the local press covered the U. of T. struggles.

comradely, Ross Dowson

(s) ROSS DOWSON TO WALTER D , MARCH 24, 1972

Dear Comrade Walter:

We are in receipt of your letter of March 21.

Some ten days or so ago we received from Montreal a copy of five documents which constitute the platform of the United Minority Tendency. Will, Ruth and yourself from Halifax and Terry from Fredericton, along with the Montreal minority tendency and others, were signers of these five documents. As you know comrade Michel Mill is both a member of this tendency and of the Central Committee of the LSA/LSO. Since your tendency will be clearly represented at the coming plenum through comrade Mill we can see no reason at all why any other comrades of the United tendency should be invited to the plenum and we are therefore not inviting you.

I have noted your preference as to the time for discussion of the appeal and can see no reason at this time why this could not be met. I have also noted your request as to documentation.

Comradely, Ross Dowson

Keith + Faye ?

November 8, 1972

47 The CUT
London S.E. 1, England
Dear Faye and Keith

It was good to get your note this morning and to hear that you are headed this way for a Christmas vacation. Of course you must get up here for the convention. If it pushes you financially we can easily put you up.

In fact if you dont come up here you are going to miss all kinds of people. Not only are Art [redacted] up here but so too are the big guns of the Revolutionary Communist Tendency---both Will and Walter , & Fredericton has changed substantially too. A leading youth comrade from there has just arrived in Toronto---and as you probably know Terry [redacted] has pulled up stakes and move it to Hamilton. So things are very narrow in Halifax over the next period. We will probably take up our future work in that area after the convention which is being held in Toronto over Chrsitmas for the youth and the New Year for the League

So we are now hearing Will in person--he is in the same branch as I am. He is not a Trotskyist who is adopting to ultra left procedures--- he is an ultra leftist period. He is so ultra that he doesn't ever try to educate us. At the last branch meeting he got up to speak on some matter and repeated his peice--we have vilated the principles of the FI we are violating the basic concepts of democratic centralism and the statutes of the FI and we are violating the fundamental concepts of Trotskyism--period. For the life of me I do not know why he holds on. to us. for obviously there is no good in us. The Will group in Montreal as you probably noted from our press has split--no more invertive that the Old Mole in Toronto. They call their press Taupe Rouge--I have only seen one issue

John Riddell just returned today from Europe but we haven't had a chance to have a talk so I know no more about England than what the Mole(which I have a hard time to bring myself to read) and the bourgeois press tells, but they seem to be as full of promise for the revol ution in England

Quiet here--getting a few licks here and a few there. Overall the federal election as a radicalizing experience for the workers. The NDP' was probably the most simple class campaign that they have so far carried. The Peking Maoists fielded a slew of candidates but put no campaign on--but regardless their token candidate pulled more than the NDP's national secretary Hachton in a Toronto riding.

Our Toronto municipal campaign has already got some good breaks --we are contesting posts in Ottawa, Vancouver and probabby Edmonton. But the big thing is our pre-convention discussion. Drop me a note as soon as you arrive in Halifax and I will send all the key bulletins to you.

I have given you note to [redacted]-Art is in Montreal temporarily looking forward to seeing you both--for as you know you must come up.

warmest regards

Ross Dowson

STATEMENT ON DRAFT RESOLUTION ON CANADA AND THE CRISIS OF WORLD IMPERIALISM

While Canada has an advanced capitalist economy with a strong capitalist class in state power, and is imperialist, Canada is rapidly approaching economic integration with the United States.

While we do not consider that this fact projects any general national tasks, with respect to English Canada, alliances of any kind with the Canadian capitalist class or any part of them (the enemy is in our own country), we think that this economic integration of Canada with the most powerful imperialist power in the world will extend and deepen responses within the ranks of the working class, which we have characterized as anti-U.S. imperialist and which we should now call nationalist - a nationalism which has been developing to an anti-capitalist consciousness.

It is not reactionary. It is not opposed in its general thrust to Quebecois nationalism for instance. We must identify with it in order to understand politics in Canada and in order to effectively propagandize our revolutionary socialist views and build the Trotskyist party.

We reject the document 'Canada and the Crisis of World Imperialism' because we consider that it essentially rejects the line of the document 'Canada -U.S. Relations' which was adopted at our 1968 convention. We think that the 1968 document requires some changes and adjustments in the light of the important developments over the past four years, however, it is our opinion, that it is one of the most precious achievments of our movement and it provides the only correct basis from which to move forward.

The document 'Canada and the Crisis of World Imperialism' fails to deal with the domination of Canada by U.S. imperialism and where it does touch on it it is entirely insufficient, if not wrong. It is incorrect in its characterization of the Canadian capitalist class from the point of view of its position in Canada and its investments on a world scale a powerful capitalist class -- in relation to the United States capitalist class and even lesser imperialist powers.

The crisis of world imperialism, focusing in on the U.S. as the chief imperialist power, does not allow greater independence of Canadaian capitalism but increasing need to adjust to the domination of U.S. imperialism.

This fact is compelling U.S. impe rialism to adopt an even more ruthless exploitation of Canadian resources and of the working class of Canada -- and to heighten the struggle of the Canadian workers against the Canadian capitalist class for its defense of U.S. capitalism's thrust to economically integrate Canada -- which we consider if not already realized, to be inevitable.

Kent
Marlon
November 14, 1972

November 14, 1972
334 Queen Street W
Toronto

Dick Prinsep
1865 west 12
Vancouver 9, BC

Dear Dick

Sorry for the delay in taking up your letter--lots of things pressing me these days.

But I am fine

Glad to hear that you were able to participate in the election campaign--not only from the paid functionary point of view but from the point of view of meeting workers coming around the campaign Overall I would think that this has been the best campaign that the NDP brass has carried--closest to raising a class line. A few speeches that Lewis gave to specialized audiences drew very clear class lines and even suggested class solutions. Generally I think they came th through strong on abortions----two of the Toronto canadidates even boastfully announced that they were active members of the abortion coalition in the Star's roundup which permitted a small photo and a short capsule comment obviously prepared by the candidate. But it was scandalous that there was not a word from where I am hearing on Vietnam

But to the point of your most immediate concern;

Yes I would be pleased to take that dough off your hands--and am prepared to sign anything that you think necessary to assure any and all that it is not really mine. I assume you drop a few words to with Macey or someone else . why dont you prepare what ever you th think desireable--send me the two copies and I will sign both and send you back one. I would get whoever you want to witness .I give you my personal guarantee that I will under no circumstances cash it or use if for any purpose other than what you authorize me. So lets go ahead

I told Phil that you thought his speech was very good--he was pleased. Good to hear that you are stillhelping out in the bookstore which I continue to hear is an example for us all.

all the best

Ross Dowson

November 15, 1972
27 Bulwer Street
Toronto 133

personal

Jack Barnes (SWP, New York)

Dear Jack

I am enclosing two items for your information.

No doubt you have received the October 29 PC minutes and you have noted that I submitted a memorandum ~~of~~ on the Press. This matter was squeezed out at that meeting but I insisted that it be circulated to the members of the political committee(not the central committee) Possibly you have the minutes of November 11 and ~~kxt~~ have noted the t it came up at that meeting--still without ~~your~~ receiving a copy of the memorandum. After last nights meeting I only conclude that it will not be circulated until at least another five or more days..

well here is a copy

The other letter I submitted to the bureau. I expected that the bureau would invite me to attend its next meeting to discuss this letter and what action might be taken. When the date of the next PC meeting was set I approached Cary and John and told them that I thought that it was necessary that they invite me to a meeting of the bureau before that meeting of the PC took place. They agreed. No such meeting has taken place at this time of writing.

As you will note I took occasion to explain in the 5th paragraph the basis of my decision not to attend the Last United Secret ~~xxxx~~ meeting. I do not know how John R explained my absence to you --but there it is.

You will note from the November 11 PC minutes that at long last a document on Canada-US relations has been presented. That was a rush discussion --the document was circualted Friday night and the meeting was Saturday morning. Six comrades were absent. Last night on the 14th another discussion was held and a vote taken. I and comrade Lomas presented a one page summary of our view to be attached to those minutes

In my opinion we are now confronted with the biggest and most important discussion that has yet taken place in the Canadian section. I do not know just how fast the office will be able to get the material out. Of course I am gravely concerned what this discussion will do to our construction of a leadership. You can be sure this is uppermost in my mind.

comradely

Ross

November 25, 1972

Dear Reba and Joe (Hansen, SWP, New York)

Enclosed is $9.05 US funds for a 6 month first class subscription to Intercontinental. I hope that this is the correct amount. I only now have managed to scrape the money together.

CBC radio
The progra on the old man was truly magnificent. They had to be in two spots on the total progra of about 95 minutes. They used the key portion of the old man's speech on the tenth anniversary of the SWP and improved on them as they had a technique that took out the surface noises on the old disc. Pierre I was very good--Shostakovich came through very well--a couple of Canada'stop actors participated one of them doing Churchill's attack on the old man better that Churchill himself could have done it. I gather the CBC's New York man was not too freindly with you--the two comrades who did all the work and the other technicians thought you got a raw deal--one portion they said is you is not your voice at all--something you wrote and they put to voice.

It has been twice on the main CBC cros--Canada network now and in view of the time and expense they went to it is hard to believe that CBC will not make a real effort that will have success in selling it to all sections of the English speaking world. In fact it would be good if we have any connections with persons who might raise the matter that US networks pick up this program. At most we have a few artistic criticisms --and minor at that. Politically it is oursall the way except for a totally ignorant and extreneuous introdutions about functionism which after hearing the program is absurd.

Enclosed is a general cartoo that might be useful

Also enclosing my first contribution to the discussion up here. I was afraid all along that the new leadership would take on our whole past positions--after they opened up that way Mitchell told me not to worry that things were not going that way. All have their own logics So we are now opening up the biggest political discussion in the history of the Canadian section

I am in good shape for it all. Except for my hearing. You know my extreme efforts to learn French. Well I had too very detailedaudio tests After the first one the doctor on the tests alone said that you would have great difficulty hearing foreigners ' English and would probably never learn another language, have difficulty hearing in large halls which do not have sound deadeners or hearing over intercommunication devices. I have boilermakers ears---as a youth I have acute hearing which has been damaged by environmental noise--big problem with Cdn Eskimoes due to these snowmobiles.

I am now working on about 5 documents. I think that it is important for the world movement. At anyrate the bets have been placed and the games on. I hear Joe that you are not too well.these days. This summer you must come up to our camp

affectionately

Ross

November 25, 1972

Winnipeg

Dear Mitch; (Bedolak)

I heard the progran on Thursday night.

Collosal

You have done a tremendous service to the revolutionary socialist movement. I cna only t inkthat the CBC will be anxious to sell that program acorss the English language world....and hundreds of thousands will heer it.

Not only is it a splendid work politicully but I think that it is a real work of art.

Criticisms---I cant think of ary that really matter--except for a next time.--another project something along the same lines--say Lenin or Marx or Engels.

my warmest regards and thanks

Ross Dowson

Notes on PC meeting November 29, 1972

crash meeting to vote on the Quebec docue tn
I made three prposals-L we remove the section on For and independent and socialist Quebec. There is no error in the 1970 document and insofar as some comrades may be seeking justification for their failure to identify with the slogan for an indpendent and french quebec there is no basis for t em to do so in that document. we never adopted for an independent and socialist Quebec to express reservation about our identity with nationalism in Quebec but as a stategic expression of our views. The 1970 document on this matter is quite correct. and clear
2) that we remove the part dealing with the 1968 document that suggests that we did not consider the trade union leadership of Quebec a bureaucracy--any attempt to suggest that rips our comments out of context. The 1968 document in this respect is absolutely correct. and clear.
3) that we lay the first nine pages of the document even in their revised form aside--that we circulate the rest of the document as a position of the PC but with the 9 pages circulated spearately for separate discussion. There are many matters in these pages which are certainly quest onable from the point of view of our theory and as has been suggested do not apparently impinge on the rest of the document.
I also said that I supported the general line of the document--and my other commen s would be withing that framework.
The first contribution following my words if I remeber correctly were John S--with a calm and straight face, obviously sincere he said that he was glad to see that I recognized that there was a trade union bureaucracy over the Quebec labor movement. John R who made a contribution shortly after felt called upon to express suprise that anyone would think that Rosa above all would not consider that there was a trade union bureaucracy in Quebec.
The debate was largely around the portions dealing with the rôle of the big three in the May events and the problems posed by the first nine pages.
It was not a good discussion but tolerable--with all the usual coverups---on wage differential between Quebec and Ont--I challenged but John reported you should have seen what it said before---expressions of impat ience and boredom about my contributio on the nature of bureaucracy in the TU movement in both Dicks and John R s comments.
~~Tom Mann and Mike~~
In his report about the coming IEC meeting and our attendance John reported that I was unable to go---- naturally I felt called upon to say that this was not true but that I had written a letter to the burea about the pc meetings particularly the one which I was forced to leave expressing that I was unprepared to go to internationa gahterings as I did not have the confidence nor the good will of this leadership. Why would John so crudley try to cover this up and what could he possibly think I would say--all the more that he made no inkling to me as to how he was going to handle it. I also reported that following the letter to the PB I was never invited to attend a meeting of the PB to discuss it although Gery had led me to belief that this was going to happen.
I did not say anything about the terrible fact that this leadership has absolutely no contact with me on any plane now. John no longer talks with me about pr blems that I send notes on and expressed great impatience last time about my omplaints he called them. Shocking but on Tuesday it must have been about 5 days after I had given Gary my contribution on A Ste p backward instead of forward John admitted to me that he had not read it. After reading it natrually Gary put it into the bulletin hopper--it lay there a couple of days. I took for granted that they made a copy for their own purposes. John Riddell had not even read it even a couple of days after it had come off and was circulating in the Toronto area. How to account for that ?
Naturally I did not stop t o take the finished document before them as there is nlothing in it that is in any substantial way differen t from what Dennis and I have been saying in the PC discussions--it is said better of oucre and more rounded--but nothing now. Eveb now a week after it has been out not one of the leadership has said a word to me about it--in fact no one has at all. Strange--everyone is uneasy as to what it means for this leadership--and I must confess the s me goes for me.
The bureau through John R saw fit to make a report on the letter that I sent to them and not the PC suggesting they consider postponing the conven ion.

John raised it before the PC as if I had brought it there--I protested that I had done no such thing--that it was they who were doing so. Then John gave a long analysis of my letter--where there were supposed to be arrors in fact and in arguem nt --debaters points--Dick chorlted sever times--an even exclaimed touche. What is this about--why is this being done. I dod not understand--a big assualt on me for my simple proposition that we postpone the convention--- god knows there are a lot of problems
Following John's report I made a short reply--I apologize, very h umbly apologize to all the comrades for having sen that letter to the PC and provided comre JR with such an opportunity to score debaters points against a simple proposition that I wante them to consider. I am very very sorry.
The meeting broke up and Stue in going buy expressed great disgust about John's sophistry.
Both Regual and Bea had already asked permission with great impatience to leave the meeting--but I understand from Lynda B that both of them hung around downstairs for some while for informal discuss on with her.

God D told me ofer the phone that he had had an increidble discussion with Darrell F about child care a discussion such as he found hard to believe would take place among Trotskyists--he also said that for some time now he had been apologizing for the leadership of the movement abou many things which he himself felt uncomforatble about but he did not see how he could continue to do so

Got a letter from Ralph Starr of CBRT stating that he is leavi ng the movement and protesting the ultra leftism in the Ottawa operation.

Had a short talth Brian B about his irritated manne with me--to came out--he thinks that I am cutting up the leadership--the day care debate at the Tueday East Branch meeting. Lots of gossip--about Pat circulating a Xerox of hier views --as if this was factional--about my stand in the branch ---he said that the allocation of resources to the daycare in the room now occuplied by Action press had not been ever discussed in the movement but had been my action--unilateral---same old bullshit of Johns about renting the pool hall.. This came up when I tried to explain to him why I was not prepared to talk with Marxiros about what we would do about his case as I felt unable to speak in the name of or commit our movement to anything--the leadership had to move in on this.

Gus T is demoralized according to Julie--has it anything to do with the state of affiars down here which is so deplorable from the point of view of doing any work. Are things starting to break up--it is becoming political just in time--a little late but--------The day care and ultra leftism around motherhood and children is hitting us before the Canada-US question and probably will result in the biggest emotional reaction ---but after all isn't this the overall problem--a giving before ultra leftist pressures on the movement
The last Toronto West end branch meeting was a real shke-up---the leaderships refuals to report on the Red Circle negotat ons, the leaderships refusal to al low discus sion on the press and the leaderships position on day care.

-30-

John Gunn tells me that Wayne and Marv are going to set up a tendency against the leadership for its bureaucratism. I told John G to tell them to stow it. But it is well founded. Ian told me when I came to pay foran IB that staff people get a desk copy for nothing. Jane was distrubed when I asked her why my name was not on the sub drive list for five subs--actually six--she said that the staff comrades were cleared from doing sub work. I told her my name must go on --I insist.
Can you imagine the brass has lost the contract with Dundalk printing that may cause us to lose $1,100 bucks. -30-

P. Kent (R.D.) Note: "Attached to Dec. 16 minutes"

Statement on the PC Minutes of November 29, 1972 by P. Kent

The minutes as recorded are in error in two places -- (1) IEC and (2) Draft Resolution on Quebec. Since they had already been mailed out to EC members when they came before the PC on December 16 for adoption and because the corrections cannot properly be made through the replacement of a word or even a phrase I am submitting the following statement for attachment to the next minutes. They can be attached to the original November 29 minutes as a correction and clarification.

(1) IEC. The minutes read: "Crandall reported Kent and Gormley unable to attend." It is true that this is essentially what comrade Crandall reported to the PC. However I immediately made a statement to the effect that I was quite able to attend the IEC meeting, that I am in good health and am able to allocate the time and also fully accept the discipline of the movement. I pointed out that I had written a letter to the bureau almost a month earlier (October 30) that referred to some incidents, particularly the October 15 PC meeting, that caused me to conclude that it is obvious "I do not even have the good will of leading comrades on the PC, let alone their political confidence", and therefore did not see how I could represent the Canadian section.

(2) Draft Resolution on Quebec. The discussion on the draft opened at the November 27 meeting with several leading Quebecois comrades in attendance. The draft had been circulated on November 26. The discussion at that meeting was somewhat limited, partly due to the fact that some comrades, including myself, had not been able to study the entire document. Comrade Charbonneau opened his report with a wide ranging criticism of the first 12 pages which he said was being withdrawn to be replaced by a new version in time for the November 29 meeting. Neither Charbonneau nor Riviere were able to attend the meeting of the 29th, and Paquette reported.

I came to that meeting with three concrete proposals. While expressing agreement with the general line of the draft I came prepared to propose three basic changes which I made known to the meeting.

My <u>first</u> proposal was on the second draft version of the first part of the document. The November 29 minutes state that this constitutes pages 1-7 of Discussion Bulletin Number 20. This is not actually correct as Bulletin Number 20 is the final version of the 2nd draft, as edited. Comrade Paquette informed the meeting that this section would be edited along certain lines. The first amendment as it appears in the November 29 minutes proposed that while adopting the

general line we "remove the first section." What this actually means is unclear, to say the least. My proposal was that we "lay aside" this section because in my opinion it was extremely contentious -- and that we circulate the rest of the document, which it was agreed stood up well separately, as the position of the PC, but that this section be circulated separately as a contribution for discussion.

The second amendment reads in the minutes that "the section on the trade union bureaucracy be extensively re-edited". My proposal in this respect was much more specific. I proposed that we remove from the draft that part dealing with our 1968 position (as appearing in the pamphlet Vive Le Quebec Libre) that suggests that we did not consider the trade union leadership of Quebec to be bureaucratized -- any attempt to suggest such a concept rips the 1968 comments out of context. The 1968 document in this respect is absolutely clear and correct. (from my notes for the meeting)

I had a third proposal that I reported to the meeting which in my opinion should be recorded in the minutes -- all the more that we were discussing a draft document prepared in collaboration with Quebecois comrades, present at the November 27 meeting, but unable to attend the November 29 meeting.

This proposal dealt with the section on page 36 of the draft, under the subtitle The National Struggle. It was critical of our 1970 resolution on Quebec titled For an Independent and Socialist Quebec. My notes, which I read as a proposal to the PC meeting, urged that "we remove the section on For an Independent and Socialist Quebec from the draft. There is no error in the 1970 document. Insofar as some comades may seek justification for their failure to identify with the slogan For an Independent and French Quebec-there is no basis for them to do so in the 1970 document. We never adopted the concept For an Independent and Socialist Quebec to express in anyway reservations about our identification with nationalism in Quebec, but as a strategic expression of our view as revolutionary socialists. The 1970 document in this matter is quite clear and correct."

I did not present this third proposal at the end of our discussion for a vote. At the November 27 discussion comrade Brock had commented on this latter matter and comrade Paquette, as reporter for the committee stated at the November 29 meeting that he agreed to the removal of this section. However since it was carried over from the first discussion and particularly in the light of the absence of two leading Quebecois comrades from this final discussion, this should in my opinion also be recorded as unanimously agreed upon.

December 1, 1972
27 Bulwer Street
Toronto
M5T-1A1

George Brietman (SWP, Detroit)

Dear George

I cannot recall how but I have learned that you are doing some serious work on the national question.

I suppose you are familiar with our documents on Quebec-Vive le Quebec Libre and For an Independent and Socialist Quebec. That is nationalism in Quebec. It has for somewhile been my opinion that an integration of the Canadian economy with that of the United States is taking place and that this has roused what can only be called a nationalism, a national sentiment across this country.

I am in the process of writing material on this question

It is a big question with many sides to it. For instance right now I am writing a modest economic analysis of Canadian capitalism.

Unfortunately this discussion is not unfolding under the best circumstances. I would much prefer that it unfold in a leisurely and non-factional atmosphere. All the more in that we are attempting to carry out somekind of transfer of leadership up here. However the younger comrades have seen fit to wh t you might say throw down the gauntlet . They are challenging some of the standing positions of the movement and in particular our 1968 convention documentation included in a pamphlet I enclose which in my opinion intelligently sensed these devel pments, making it possible for us to graps hold of their implications.

First I thought you might like to be informed of these developments.

Second should you care to I would be pleased to hear your opinion.

You can be sure I would not use any opinion that you ight express without your agreement --and of course my strong inclination is to keep any opinion you might express strictly between ourselves.

comradely

Ross Dowson

December 1, 1972
27 Bulwer Street
Toronto M5T 1A1

Ralph Starr
Ottawa

Dear Ralph

The copy of your letter to John K caught me as a complete suprise. I did not reply to it immediately as I did not want to interfere in the normal process of our movement. John Riddell is now our national secretary and I immediately informed him of your letter--he has since contacted Joe who I gather is the League organizer.

I am sending this reply through Joe for two reasons. Not that there is any reason why I should not respond to you directly of course. First I do not have your address--it may have been on the envelope which I threw away and I do not want to use your office address. Second, I want to assure the comrades in Ottawa that as chairman of the League I am not working in anyway underneath them and if there might be any doubt, that we all have a common attitude to the main thrust of your letter.

You say you are leaving the movement and later that you have been soured from participating after the December convention. I have read through the material between those two statements and it does not sustain either one. You write as a Trotskyists who sees the Ottawa branch veering off what you consider to be Trotskyist norms, both organizational norms and the Trotskyist concept of politics. Both are very serious--and in my opinion call upon a Trotskyist to fight back--to fight for the re-establishment of these essential concepts.

Of course your letter to John and copy to me is just that, I take it--an action to tell responsible comrades of the situation in the Ottawa branch--and your maximum statement that you are leaving the movement, an expression of a feeling of inability on your own part to do much about the situation in Ottawa.

I am not familiar with the situation at this time in Ottawa but I know many of the comrades personally and for a number of years. If they are not Trotskyists then I assure you Ralph they are the closest persons to Trotskyism for many many miles around. And speaking for myself I am going to do everything humanly possible to straighten them up along the lines necessary to fully realize themselves.

I want to make a bloc with you Ralph and any and all members of the League---to keep you in the movement and help bring Ottawa back, if it has strayed off--back to Trotskyism.

I read the contents of your letter, and as I say I am out of touch with the Ottawa situation. However I am very much in touch with the central operations of our movement and with the Toronto branches--particularly the West Toronto branch. I am enclosing a copy of our internal bulletin number 13. I am sending a copy direct as I understand from Joe that the bundle has not yet arrived which as a branch member you could get a copy. I hope you will take the time to read it over very closely--not just my contribution but comrade Lomas' contribution. The latter essay in a general way seems to me to take up some of the problems that you say exist in the Ottawa branch.

Perhaps the Ottawa situation is by no means unique but is merely a reflection in Ottawa of a political problem in the pan-Canadian movement.

If this is so then we all have the responsibility to participate in the pan-Canadian discussion and the convention itself to the limit in order to correct the problem.

I am looking forward to hearing from you as to your opinion of the material in bulletin No .18

with socialist greetings to you and Margaret and of course to the children including the one on the way

Ross Dowson

December 5 1972

I was working the store the other day when to my suprise John R walked by into the hdqtrs. I called Him into the store to express my suprise and unease that he was still in Canada. We had the 24 hour crash decision on the Quebec resolution on Wednesday last on the argument when I protested that Art, Joan and John had to leave to Europe the next morning. As it was I was suprised to see Joan at the PC as the day before they had told me that they were meeting her at the airport--she had a stop over of 1 hr on her way. Anyway ~~mxm~~ John turned up at the Sunday morning discussion in the East branch on Canada and the Crisis of World ipmerialism and then hre he was still here on Monday. People were in the store so he told me he would tell me later. Later that afternoon a telegram came for him--I could not locate him on the intercom so I opened the telegram in front of Phil--it was from Naomi telling John that she was reconciled to his not coming over the pond.

Last night John came up to the apartment to talk to me. It was about a three hour talk. wide ranging--to tell me various things, to feel me out and perhaps to express some feelings.

I told him that I was astonished that he had not spoken to me about the IEC--that of course if there was some difficulty with his going I would certainly have gone--abd this was quite incomprehensible to me. He was all apologies about this. It turns out he decided he should stay to help through with the Pol Rstn- and perhaps the uebec thing but it seemed apparent to me that he is really worried about the situation here.

We supplemented one another about the complete paralysis in our work on every level here in Toronto. After his disgraceful attack on my proposal that we postpone the convention(I told him how scandalous it was) he tells me that they actually hadn't made up their minds on the PB and they are now considering its postponment. There is a problem about 8 persons in BC having made arrangements to come here over Chrstmas which I dismissed--apparently he was sympathetic to my urging that it be Easter. He sees big problems about staff--I gather he tinks that at least three persons will have to be let go off payroll and he is worried how to come to grips with this. It appears he even understands the clique like operation he has been instrumental in setting up. I do not understand how he sees the CO--it would appear that Gary is going into the Toronto operation--and John S is ready to accept working under him is how I think John R put it. Who in the CO--perhaps John S--no mention of Jacquie except that she is champing at the bit to get going on WL and abortion. Probably they are going to drop Ian--but who other? I suggested that they ~~xxx~~ they encourage Coral to go West and put someone in the store who I would show the rposes to--and mentioned Crescent too. He was embarassed that they did not invite me into discussion on Crescent --re Black Rose but tried to epphasize how it would be better that we are strictly our own materail agen s and then comrades in out of town areas would pitch in on promotion--one would gather that MR was an embarass ment politically to our forces

At one point we exchanged a few words about the political differences expressed on Can da US relations-- I tried to tell him that he was wrong in tackling it from the nationalist question but it had to be tacked from economic integration---this big challenge to our movement and our ideas-- a phenomena--itegration of two advanced capitalist powers the one the super imperialist power--never before contempated. It would appear that he was relieved to hear that we think that there are conflicting interests between the two bourgeoieis even when I insist that~~xxxx~~ on the part of the Cdn they ca not go any where--i ~~xxxxxxxxx~~ repeated to him our classic concept of the role of the state--to uphold bourgeois power against proletarian and to reconcile into some kind of national policy the conflicting interests of the various bourgeois even within the ~~xxx~~ nation

Is he really floundering and does he not understand what is at discussion--he is anxious that I put this all down. Does he not know that John S told the West branch in debate against Dennis that integration means revisionism of Marxism--their document to my sup rise in rereading the final version and the draft--toys with integration.

He complained about my non collaboration--he attacked me -exposed me as having failed to ever having worked out a collaboration with anyone--that is history of our section- I told him that I had always thought that he and I and even Jacquie had been in my opinion close collaborators of mine and I did not undertsand what happened. But now we have politics to discuss--what with their document on Canada and the crisis of World Imp He sees a big shake up when the comrades come back from Europe--he agrees that Art go to Montreal--it appears that Penny would stay here--I told him she had to get out of here a terrible influence-- nd besides my impression Art needed her- I told him I changed

my mind re my suggestion that Art could handle Europe--
. Then he told me about the montreal discussion--he remined me that I told him that their relations with Alain was completely unprincipled. Well it seems that the last discussion here around the document they worked out their main problems with him. It seems that he had written the first nine pages that they withdrew en bloc the next night--and he wrote the replacement. There has been aparalysis in Montréal--Paul and Colleen unable to communicate with Ain--John D seems swinging back again. It appears that Alain is having big personal difficulties with Marilyn and he was going off the beam as in the first nine pages--he had carried the envelope theory to the extent of dismissing the class character of the April May events. Obviously I will have to most seriously consider how i take on the first nine pages. all t is confusion about the class structure of Quebec appears to have been Alain's--- very very serious

Back to Toronto--we talked about the decay here--lack of vôlunterrism, paralysis-- we need the convetnion postponement in order to get the movement geared as an operation again. Appears that John thinks that Joe Y has got us involved in a great deal of unproductive work. He apparently knows very little about our Vancouver womens liberationist leaderSharon--she was on staff in Van---who we brought to Ottawa and who broke down and turned up in Clarke Institute here. It is not clear to me but it seems Joe had been worried but did not act--she apparenlty just got here in Toronto--John wanted to check up on my sourse of information--Brian B. He said he would look into it. ~~Xxxxxxxxx~~ Sharon is the second breakdown among our tope women liberationists-- preceeded by Kate.

At one point John he asked me very seriously and worried what did I think was happening to our leadership and here was it going to end. This came up in the process of other t ings and appears not to have been posed as a question for me to answer--how could I answer.

After all I see John R as one of the main problems of leadership---his dillentantism his flippant interjection of information and argument that is really irrelevant and only serves to confuse and buttress his argument. I told him that I thought that my debating Darrell on Canada and Crisis---Darrell presented the line but in an extremely personal way--that Ross says th s doesn't understand this--has to answer that etc. He injected that he thought Darrell did a brilliant job--I told him it was disgracefull with both him there, Phil, and George Add of the PC and then thrust Darrell in to present the document in such a way as he did too. An insult to me and would be understood by all the comrades as such. Of course in my contribution I said nothing at all about Darrell's contribution but dealt with the document and the issues as I see them.

The discussion was broken up by a call for him--as we left the question of the Star letter from Ottawa came up--it appears that he is writing Ralph about his decision to leave the movement ~~xxxxxxxxxxxx~~ I sent the copy of my letter to Joe but decided to give John R my file copy here.

Yes where are we going! Could I tell him that I can only see us heading to a real crisis and a collapse of various elements in the leadership. I raised the matter of some comrades coming up from the youth--they havent come to grips with this--except th. that Don T is going to Vancouver to overcome the problem that I told them would develo he aggreed that it has--an all woman leadership. Yes, what could I tell him--I do not know where we are going. While we talked up here the West branch passed its clealr ultra left line on day nursery. Clearly we need time for the discussion to get underway, so we can discuss the politics of the problem and so a new sorting out can take place.. Yes where are we going---right now he agreed we are paralyzed --and i told him with an office leadership that has practically introduced the salute , that doesn't participate in the li fe of the movement

Pall & Reader (notes by R.D.)

December 7, 1972

Last nights meeting of the East End branch saw the leadership step back from its previous weeks skeletonal in fact resual to take the membership in anyway into acquaintanceship with negoations with the Red Circle, last week anyone interested was urged to speak to thesomeone in the CO. This week Gary gave a report on the processes --it was very good report and I gather from his comments he is repeating it to the West Branch. Stue,omo I think it was Will made a motion that all the materials be published in the IB preparatory to the convention. Gary's response was not good--he automatically treated it as a tendency motion which Stue objected to--if I recall correctly he chastized Will for not having Stue raise it on the PC. But the report was a good one from what I know of the situat on and seemed to satisfy the comrades. The Red Circle has called the last few scheduled meetings off because of the coming NDP convention. The leadership also pulled back from its position of last week--no evaluations of the press are not to be made at the branch meetings but you can send a letter to the editor line. Time was allocated . Pat M make a criticism of the last issue's line on the NDP. She felt that contrary to the previous issues it made no substanisal criticism of the election campaign and thereby undercut the case for the left caucus, let alone for the LSA. Mike Griticized the layout and type faces. George Addison took to answer these comments--not good when it came to Mike as Mike for all his folloies scored some correct points--the paper is now poorly laid out--George challenged him to pitch in and help correct the siaution with his own labor--not very good. Alan C claimed that our press recnelty has failed to make an analysis of the tasks before the working class-the case for revolution and in this framework stated o our position of support of the NDP but on the contrary has merely put a position of support of the NDP with modest criticism. This went by without comment --we will have to take up this criticism Skomoro made an even more tranchant critcism of the last forum and our line there which I will have to check out later.

But the big issue at this meeting was THE DEBATE ON CHILDCARE. the 5th

Looking back at John R's discussion with me just the nigh. before--a reopening of discussions with one another -- it is hard to understand it--hard to understand why he did not tell me what he thought of my roll in the discussion on childcare

John R after trying to butte up to Pat M and Jim M as having made helpful contributions turned on me sharply--as making a contribution which was not only unhelpful but that rasied insinuations --that there was a question of anti-children and antimother tendencies in the Metro executive line and my comments protesting what I allegee is a dumping of the past of the movement ware a form of baiting. Phil of course was equally sharp said that all the talk about anti-mother and anti-child tendencies were nothing but a reflection in the movement of the classic attacks on Bolsheviks that they reflect bourgeois ideas into this movement. He singled out Pat and I suppose you might say Zane who suggested a double standard--one for staff and another for the membership--paricularly the second class theory of membership as an indication of where those persons are at and what they think of this movement. Very Very sharp but not a word to me at anytime before the meeting--both barrels at the meeting.

The discussion generally. In this debate the central leadership put its leadership on the line--and it was defeated 18 to 16 with one abstention. I can still hardly grasp it --why they made this such an issue and how I misread the whole situation. Darrell approached me just before the meeting commenced and asked me if it was ok if he started off with ten minutes, that I have ten and then Pat have ten. I told him that I had said essentially all I had to say in my one page statement which I of course had read the previous branch meeting, that it was ok but I would only need a few minutes. But when I heard Darrell [illegible] brilliant about last nite--see how this leadership is going to be sorted out--doesn't understand my dismay. I think he said something about maybe we will save about 30%. Due to circumstances we had you as in a sense a one man leadership with great authroity--now they are trying to operate with the same authority and cannot carry it because of their confused ideas.

Wayne phoned up to tell me that he had just read my document(18) and fully agrees. wants me to come to supper on Tuesday--he and Marv are writing something on the NDP

-Gord D phoned to say that he t inks that he is in substantial agreement with my document which he has not quite finished. Apparently he has been u easy about things in general for sometime and the docuemtn reassures him as to the trouble. Feels he has some disagreements with regards to nationalism--stands on anti-imperialist sentiment. He came up for a talk--to go through parts of Canada and the Crisa of world imperialism He thinks our leadership is adapting to ultra left pressures--to Red Circle ---back t o the branch m eting. Darrell attemtped to make out that there is a current in the movement that thinks that the revolutionary party is a mitual aid society and thisc has to be beat down--presumably Ross and Pat. The party as an institution has absolutely no obligations to the i dividual members--line comes through quite clearly. He also stated that it is incorrect to relate this dispute in anyway whatsoever to the pre-convention discussion dispute--then he moved to individual points--he attacked the set up of the day care room in what is now taken over as Action Press--the movements (Ross)' appraoch to this whole thing was ~~that~~ light minded and irresponsible. I then spoke. I tried to point out that there is no principle involved here at all--my proposal is quite clear when we can with the resources we can we are committed to provide in this case facilities for child care so that comrades with children can come to participate in the work of the movement as fully as possible. I attacked the no ns children stricture in Gary's statement I also took on this consistant attempt on the part of some comrades to make out whatever we did in the past was stupid wrong, illcon sidered and irresponsible. There is nothing in this attitude for our movement--it was totally destructive.

The tendency opposed the Metro-Porter statement---with Will talking about the tremendous resources of the movement by speculating on the staff and the big wage bill.

Everyone was lined up to speak. Liz's contribution was sad--to say that the movement isn't going to allocate funds to daycare is bullshit--we will make decisions from day to day--Ross proposal would have us set up a day care center in perpeutity Loran said she would read what the SWP has to say on this-I asked her to read the whole statement. She read only a short paragraph that expressed concern in one branch that a core of comrades getting pregnant would really hit at the work of the movement--quite irrelevant--sugg esting perhaps we were against birth control and were for women comrades to all have children but it served a purpose of placing the SWP on their side. Sandy got up as treasurer to complain that we were in terrible debt and Ross proposal would leave us open to a terrible expenditure much more than the $50 that appears to be involved.

The general line was to claim that the document did not in anyway oppose allocating funds to day care or resources but in general supported this concept leaving the matter to be decided on specific cases.

Alice K got up and ridiculed all this double talk--there is nothing in the document that suggested principled agreement and a day to day decision on its application but just the opposite. Forgot--John added to this double talk line with a poignant few words that he and Naomi were going to have a child and they had allocated the resources for th this and he did not want this baby to appear on the expsne sheet of the movement.

Jim M got up after Sharonn also unfortunately though taking a correct line dissociated herself from my views which she interpreted as carrying the line that we had to pr vide funds for all daycare eventualityies. Jim proposed that the Metro exec statement be ref erred back wit h two suggested changes--delete third sentence on second page--"the costs of childcare cannot be assumed by the movement, just as other personal needs of comrades cannot be paid for by the movement" I had attacked this as contrdciting the next sentence which said-When the party does undertake to organise childcare etc." Torephradse the second from bottom paragraph that contains the section about children not coming to the headqurters. Immediately right beside me Joe K and Darrell expressed opposition so I knew there w s no compromise--so I did not vote on this...the leadership had everyone lined up against this--others abstained. The vote to endo se the MEC statement was called and it was defeated 18 to 16 one abstained. They lined up everybody they could for a real showdown and were defeated as it would appear obvious they would be--of course they would have been even more decisively defeated without their campaign. The comrades are very fgithened of my criticisms--as imperilling the movement.

I phoned Pat to see if she talked with Jane who making her contribution chastized herself for having children and broke down. Pat said it was ok as Marg took her home. In passing I learned that Pat found out that North branch voted 8 against and one for one abstained. So leadership has about a two vote majorty---Pat thunks they are not use it

--I told her that I hope that they do and this thing is over. She told me that after arguing against the section about keeping children home she went home and cried for three hours--that her kid is not wanted anywhere--by her family and now by her comrades--that her kid always wants to go to the headqureters where our friends are. Kathy said that Pats and Ross's contributions refelct liberal concepts not bolshevik Hans said leaderships policy flows from an overconcern or worry by the leadership about their extrawdinary responsibilities--they are on a super revolutionary bent. Mike hot out against people trying to tell leadership what they are doing--you have to be loyal to the leadership--and read a section by Trotsky on the vital character of the party in the back of our organizational concept
Is the leadership going to read this correctly--- a defeat for their absurd position and start to rethink, reconsider---or are they going to be goaded into drawing the lines even sharper against any opposition. I cannot say--had a bit of a talk with Darrell--he is not re-thinking--nor is Linda !

After the branch meeting opinions on NDP line in LC and Skamoro on the way back from York I decided to go to the meeting of delegates and alternates we have going to the NDP convention. Amazing at this most important meeting where there are serious dis agreement not one of the leadership appeared. Regula and Peter not there--maybe working but neither Dick, Phil, John S, John R--no one but Darrell. Mood very bad--defeatist--Had kidded Zane I would go with a bandiad over my mouth so I would not speak but I had to. They were talking about a campaign mass actio against the strikebreaking outfits which the govt has already subk. I told them to prepare to intervene in defsmc of the hopstial workers against the new anti-union legisaltion and support of Western strikers--told them to speak on Hydro where public funds used to smash strike and the need for workers control. They were going to go along with a motion of support or con gratulations to setting up of Misc I told them this was a dirty motion to cover up and justify their ~~maintainmxxfxxxthe~~ all out attack on Waffel and the quitting of some under those circumstances and we had to expose it as a dirty devise to support their idea that Waffle should always have set itself up outside the NDP. In the debate over calling a women's caucus--Tendency wantes it called in name of left caucus with a deifined left program which of course would be self-defeating---I suggested we get some established women's leaders to call it--everyone happy. Next morning taked to Darrell--suprised too over absence of leading comrades and pleased that I spoke up.

I was on the verge of handing in my commetns on the draft intro for Pol Restn. Then thought it over---where do we stand--can I collaborate--seems absurd after Tuesday declaration of war--why should I build their defenses . We need a discussion. The draft PR section contains the false concept of internationalism in Canada--crissi of world imperialism. I have tkane back my notes---let us see what they intem to do. I gather they are hating no PC meetings until Art-Joan and Alain return.

December 8, 1972

Vancouver
Dear Dick

I received your note this morning, I have drawn up the statement and have put it with this note for John R to sign. I suppose you will put it aside somewhere as will I so that it will not fall astray---and the matter is closed.

Yes--you might say a "reform" slate got elected in Toronto. John Sewell's comments were interesting. As you know he has been the most representative community politician in the city--very vigorous, militant and apparently incorruptable--and while he doesn't practice clear working class politics is known as NDP. After he and Jaffray swept back into office he said that he was thinking of changing his image--a hari cut--off the leather coat and jeans and take a working class line---he said that what has been elected is a small liberal slate and now we have to return it into a reform slate. To everyone's shock instead of resting on the victory he made a declaration of war. He said we havent won anything--in fact we lost every fight on the old plane. So who knows we may soon start to move onto class politics in Toronto municipal affairs.

We havent made an apprecaition of our campaigns. ..probably will do so next branch meetings. Compared to previous campaigns it was a modest one in my opinion. We did not put out a mass circulation leaflet and so didn't do mass distributions door to door as in the past. We probably tended to move more in politics as they now are at in Toronto. No doubt you read the insert to the paper. I personally was suprised to see that with Jacquie ,a woman,and a very presentable and able candidate that we did not do much better than the CP. The CP rank Nelson Clarke a sort of dissident in the party--and after examining all the lists of candidates it would appear that the CP which has always run if not a real slate as a few years ago a fairly presentable list--I was suprised to see that they ran not another candidate. There were no other left candidates aside from Bob Fairley. The NDP ran label candidates in Scarboro but I t ink they got defeated. I would suppose there will be a real analysis in the coming issue of Labor Challenge. Crombie made a strong liberal-humanitarian appeal. O'Donohue who had Gerry Gallagher's support made a cruse a peal to the Ca tolic vote which it would seem to me must hav have cost him something

I think they will sign the deal over Vietnam. It is key to the whole detente that is underway across the globe. After China did in the JVP in Ceylon and underwrote Pakistan the door was open for Nixon to move out everywhere--even Cuba it would seem...and Latin America. Without mass revolutionary vanguard party's it is not hard to turn back radicalization which is not rooted firmly in objective reality--in the masses, in the working class. Interesting and big days we live in.

Hope this note finds you well--cant help saying that I still visulaize your coming in here t o the camp. I think it is a good proposition.

comradely

Ross

December 18, 1972

Today as I was passing th ough the hall to work the bookstore(Monday) Dick stopped me and asked me if I would be available., later. I surmised that he wanted me to read over the article on MISC. I surmised this because after i put Addision's document ~~in~~ main reply to my Memorandum II to a vote John commented that they were thinking about making some adjusmtnets on the editorial board,which seemed directed to me. Addison's reply was just tossed into the meeting--they were not going to do anything about it, not discuss it or anything else. I made a statement about its factional character and its outright and offhand rejection of what they all know I actually proposed--open the paper- let me see certain articles they know are controversial etc. After speaking to Dick I picked up this reply to my memorandum, of just the day previous to read it again. Do I not understand simple English,I ask myself. Aside from its false contention that the 1968 position is dumped by a plenum,is this or is this not an utter and ruthless and cy ical reply to tell me to go to hell! Am I all screwed up from the hassles of the past 8 months or so.
Or---do they have not the slightest idea what they are doing--their taking the day care question to the wall, their having Darrell reply to Ross Dowson while they sit in the bleachers---John R, George A and Phil C--they letting me be kicked out of the West Toronto branch. Are these all including the plenum etc etc just mistakes that should cause me to have a most fr ternal and corrective attitude to and not weigh them for , make judgements about them for, draw conclusions about!
That is John R's line. I asked him to come into the store so that I could tell him that I would appreciate it if he would tell Dick that I saw no purpose in my going over the MISC article and that I could see no purpose if it was in his mind that I should go on the editorial board. He is furious---I am not collaborating with them ,that even Livio and Ernest dont conduct themselves this way. He cann t seem to grasp the scope of the differences and on top of that the intolerable factional atmosphere on every level of our coming to gether--from the East branch to the BC. He ccused me of wanting to replace this leadership--shape up or ship out--on my turns. I told him that I t ought the shape up or ship out was rought but I certainly wanted them to shape up. He started yelling about their making mistakes--but that everything had to be on my terms
This outburst comes following their receipt of my correction to the November 27 minutes which foolishly record that I was unable to go to the IEC, thatmy motion had been to reject the first pages of the uebec document. Despite the intmductory comments that I wanted the corrections to go in the minutes--he asked me was it for the bureau. He seems to be fearful that the international would know of the situation here as if our tendency hasn't told them all about it. Then at the 17th meet ng we get George Addison's reply to my memorandum. Absurd. I sent them the memorandum October 29--we receive George's reply at the meeting of December 17 fresh from the mimeograph machine---and it has the date of November 20 on it. What crap.

Incidently on Sunday nite Lynda-Denis--Zane and I discussed the problem of how we should operate--we postponed taking any decision until just prior to the plenum.

December 20, 1972
27 Bulwer Street
Toronto M5T 1A1
Canada

SWP C.O.

Dear Jack (Barnes)

SWP

I understand that some comrades at Cleveland reported that they heard the CBC Tuesday Nite program Leon Trotsky ,a biography, thought it was sensational and raised the idea of it being published by Pathfinder.

Of course before it could be seriously considred you would want a tape to hear it.

I was speaking to the two comrades who prepared the program for CBC and who have all rights on it. They would be happy if Pathfinder thought it worthy of publication and are prepared to sell publication right for $1.00 (U.S. funds no doubt) Joe can write for a tape, as a non-paid contributor to the program,and as a Trotsky archivist---for educational purposes

Joe should write to Walter Unger, 561 Portage Ave, Winnipeg, Manitoba and he will certainly get a copy free. If after hearing it you think it worth publishing just drop me a line and I will forward it to the comrades involved. They are still trying to sell broadcasting rights to BBC England and to the Australian nationally owned netwrok. They have had no luck in the US as yet--they tell me there are no nation-wide networks except those carrying news.

That's for Joe

I am also enclosing a copy of bulletin No 21. There are two items that I would appareciate George receiving --item No 1 on Anchitka which I did not even know had been submitted. It is somewhat relevant to the discussion up here. and item number 2. As this got delayed in the typring pool I got the original copy and sent it to George B--but he no doubt would prefer the bulletin copy of this contribution by Dennis. In an ther day or so I hope the pool will have made some progress and got to the first part of my second contribution to the disucssion up here. In this contribution I try to get at the key issue the new problem posed before us of Canadian economic integration with the US --in my opinion the materialist roots of this new Canadian nationalism--a sense of national identity that has not existed amongst the Canadian people in any substantial sense which is arising with the US economic takeover of the ecoconmy and incidentally at the same time as uebec nationalism has taken on a mass character. I should have the second part of the economic analysis done by this weekend --and then will be taking up several other matters--the nature of imperialism, the history of nationalism in Canada, etc etc.

Thanks for turning this stuff over to Joe and to George B--I have neither address---besides you might have a few moments to scan if

conradely

Ross

December 25, 1972
Toronto--27 Bulwer St M5T LA1

Brian Waite
Vancouver

Dear Brian;

I sent along your copy of the Recuud of Proceedings and Decision of Board of Referees. They sent one for me along wit h yours

Well what do you think!

As you will see I am noted as having said that you were available for work in Toronto. They claimed tnat you had to be available in order to collect--of course you were in transition. I see they also made use of Exhibit 2--your letter of resignation where you say,of course I have not found this condition so debilitating as to prevent me from working

. ...

I note that you can make an appeal within 60 days of Dec 15, 1972. ...and also that the Board of Referees was unanimous in its findingz. I await your instructions. I myself doubt very much that we ca get anywhere with it--however as I say I await your instructions.

I am glad to hear that you are managing to make out ok--with a little help from your friends

and to hear that both you and Nick support my first response to the PC majority position. As you know they have now agreed to postpone the convention until Easter That is necessary not only because they have not yet got the political resolution but but because the discussion has not really got underway. Last week East Toronto had the first discussion on the Quebec document--not actually the discussion--it was presented verbally to the comrades and nobody has made a contribution yet. We need the time very badly in my opinion as we have a big educational task. I was xx at a pre-Christmas social a few nigh s ago at Harry Fai es. Sharon R and Ellan L were both there and we got into a discussion on women's liberation. The confu sion in their minds--both able and serious comrades in absolutely unbelievable. As a matter of fact I tended to conclude that we were really moving in the direction of xmxm dumping the abortion coalition in favor of involvement is women's studies e etc. Jacquie in a recent report on Vancouver work said that it is not really clear yet whether we are going to emphasize our work in the NDP or the coailtion... ...so I am begin ing to be not at all sure,when the say that abortion is the central focus of our women's liberation work what they really mean.

All kinds of things are happening that are peculiar. Here is the massive escalation of US bombing of N Vietnam. Te report in our branch is that we are going to picket a concert that Mitchell Sharpe is going to play at. I immed.ately told the comrades that Sharpe had made a very clear condemnation of the escalation and that while we could picket him we really should take the demo to the US consulate. After all the US imperialist bourgeoisie is actaully doing the bombingin the belief that maybe my comments didn't get through to the leadership I went down a day or so before out demo at the conc.ert to spaek to John S. Our leaflet promised some NDP and trade union spokesmen at the Massey Hall affair. I told John that that it not believable to me. Canadian complicity is not the main issue all the more with Sharpe xxxxxxxx --it is the issue only with conscious revolutionary socialists

and I would be very much suprised if any NDP or TU spokesman would appear at Massey Hall---in fact there would only be the revolutonary left at such a limited and narrowly focused action. I had no effect on him obviously although he didn't rebut my comments. Well that is what we had--what you might call the Trotskyist left--- the Labor Action squad, the Lynn Marcus squad, the LSA-YS mobilization and one or two anti-war activists like Lucan Robinson, 100 to 150. One would guess that we are only interested in ant-war protests that a clearly focussed against the Canadian bourgeoisie--end Canadian complicity--and not against US imperialism. I heard over TV that some 20 persons picketted the Sinclair residence in Vancouver where one might expect Trudeau to be---I hope it wasn't us.

What can youdo to help in the discussion? Well I have just read the Quebec document over closely. At the preliminary discussion on the PC I said with Den is tha we agreed on the main line and then made three propositions. One of them was that the section on the trade union bureaucracy must be rewritten. I hope you have a copy by now. On the basis of my and Dennis' argument they have put that part in on the bottom of page 28 and the top of 29 on the nature of the trade union bureaucracy. But in my opinion it is for laughs. I reality they treat the Quebec trade union leadership--the big three, like we would handle William F Green The May even s proved our view up to the hilt. With the line of the Quebec document on trade unicnism we will never be able to build a left wing caucus in the unions. I am sure all militants most clearly identify with the big three particularly with Laberge. The bigge t trade union issue today and biggest Quebe issue to day is solidarity with the big three who if they lose their appeal go to jail for a year ---interesting that LC says nothing about this, even the Dec 25 issue and there wont be another until Jan 22....Free the Big Three. Do you think you could make a contribution on this trade union question with Quebecois overtones--you would need the back issues of Liberation and be able to translate French to handle our coverage. They would have them at 1208.

Then you will recall in my document--the first and general one I raise 6 points . I am now finishing the second part of a two part contribution on economic analysis showing that Canada is being economically integrated with the US. XXXX The first part would have been out a couple of weeks ago but for the youth convention documentation shoving it aside. As soon as it is off I will rush a copy off to you and Nick. I am almost finished a special xxxxxxxx contribution on the role of Candn banks how instead of as the leadership says they are a a bulwark against the US takeover they have suffered the same fate as industry and were and are instruemtnal in the takeover. I am planning a document on imperialism and another on the state which in a non-Marxist way they have abstrated from ecoconimc underpinnings.

You know they concede US role in Quebec is imperialist but not in Canada as a whole--or separated out English Canada. They object to the phrase Canada is an imperialized imperialism. They only see imper lisms role as strsight determinenatl to the ecoconmy --in point 4 I show its contradictroy character and I intend to show that US relations with Canada are imperialistic. How would you like to take this on..... The stare one is interesting too. Then again why do you have to fit into my pattern of documentation- It would be good to do your own things. It would be valuéable for comrades to know that some serious comrades agree with Lomas and Dennis. The discussion is only opening---the N Toronto branch except for Bea agrees with Dennis and I--Gord Doctorow is strong and ready for battle.

I hope that Nick is coming in for sure. I would very much like to talk over with him the total problem--before, during and after the plenum. My feeling is that we are headed for the formation of a tendency---but I would not want to move that way without agrem net of some leading comrades like Nick

Drop me a line about the case and other matters. As I say I will send you a copy of the documents as they come out post haste. A Very good contribution on Amchitka from the two Vancouver youth leaders. Nick will recall it cut right across Joan and Reg at the plenum.

comradely

Ross

UNDATED—IN 1972

What the RCT has to say on Canadian nationalism bulletin 45

E4-1972 (vote to self)

the~~y~~ see ~~[illegible]~~ this nationalist sentiment as having mass proportions but that it has a limimted social base--confined to the petty bourgeois intelligentsia and the student milieu. The working class remains relatively indifferent. The workers are relatively indifferent to the question and the nationalist currents~~are~~ in the labor movement are weak and isolated. ..~~although~~ they talk of the breakaway movement in the unions but see it more a reaction against bureaucracy than an expression of nationalism. They see it as dying, with less influence in the left and being identified with reformism .As the imperialist criris hits Eng-Can the pol basis of this nationalism ~~[illegible]~~ They differentiate this nationalism from the nationalism of the bourgeoisie. They see this nationalism as being petty bourgeois . They see it as an ideological phenomenon of considerable scope. Not as a rejection of US capitalist society but rather as a desire to avoid being enveloped by its effects. The petty bourgeois see the US as disturbing their petty bourgeois social tranquility--and they have created a nation--art, literature --Canadian nationalism reflects a preliminary stage in the crisis of bourgeois ideology RCT sees this nationalism as being utopian and that is why it has a limited social base it is a response to the crisis of imperialism--the fact that this crisis is essentially external and has not hit Canada internally explains why this sentiment(widespread) in unable to coagulate as a strcutired political movement

They see the nationalism of the Canadian bourgeoisie as being much ~~more~~ less ambiguous than this petty bouregeois nationalism. Bourgeois nationalism will be explicitly reactionary -identifying with ~~the~~ capitalism and the state-for the defenhse of the existing social order--not at all like this NEW(RD) nationalism --the bourgeois natiinalism will have a rather tenuous basis and quite different from the tenuous anti-American sentiment --because of a lack of natiinal tradition and the bourgeoisies obvious relati ionship with US imperialism it will have a tenuous ideological basis. Since Canada is imperialist its natiinalism is reactionary.

(RD)

~~[illegible]~~jm This NEW nationalism is objectively reactionary. It is rooted in the crisis of world imperialism but interprets this crisis as a crisis among nations rather than of the system of social relations--capitalism. It projects the construction of an autarchic self-enclosed economic and social entity rather than the trans formation of social relations on either a national or international scale--this is its weakness --With te crisis developing social conflixt inside English Canada its political basis" will be severely undermined. On page 23 they use the term "new nationalism" cant be understood without understanding "the specificty of the Canadian culutral and ideological matrix and the effect of contiental integration and the US social crisis upon the ideological equilibrium of the Canadian social formation"-- they later conclude that it is petty bourgeois

They reject the United Tendencies"orientation " to it. and they ridicule the Pol Ctee majority for its pious statements of principle as a substitute for a concrete analysis They ask--how did this phenomenon appear and what social forces does it actually rep resent. They characterize the majority's response as purely ultra left and abstract in response to potential natiinalist sentiments in the workers movement

So they talk of Canadian nationalism being bourgeois and having a socialist in quote variant

They see a new nationlaism. ~~I think we would agree as to [illegible] what the class nature of its ideology is--petty bourgeois.~~ They differentiate it from bourgeois nati ionalism. They do not deny its scope nor that it is radical--anti-imperialist. I would say that they concede that it has a radical thurst but they think that it is loosing its influence in the left gnerally and is fated to die with the rise of the class struggle which they see right on the horizon

They see the question as being improperly posed by Dowson and by Kidell--whether Canad is or is not dominated by US imperialism. Dowson says it is and superficially concludes in the finest tradition of bourgeois formal logic that Canadian nationalism has therefore an anti imperialist essence. They dont continue with this line of thought but I would gather that they reject this approach of essence-for a socological analysis. I do not see why one would oppose an orientation to this new nationalism wherever it finds expression on the basis of a sociological definition--[illegible] that it is utopian --it raises questions that the socialist can answer. But you would disagree with an orientation if this [illegible] influence is on the decline doesn't exist in the working class and differentiate the demand for TU autonomy from nationalism.

They would agree with our economic analysis and see it useful to show how bourgeois nationalism will be explicitly reactionary. They seeit as behind this [illegible] nationalistresponse by the petty bourgeois which cannot structure it [illegible] and they see this Canadian nationalism as being seriously undermined by the developing crisis. They have a crisis [illegible] concept

TU orients to Majority — declare war on Gov't — RCT — ignore

They put this in the same category as abortion law repeal capital punishment etc

New ntom objectively reactionary } abstentionist
NDP a bourgeois party }

(Reject politics - cause being given voice by petty bourgeois - art of revty (revolutionary) politics is ourability to inject

Reject politics - cause being given voice by petty bourgeois - art of revty politics is our ability to inject

3 UNDATED FRAGMENT (in 1972)

There is a new element in the debate. The Intern tional majority has launcehd through the pen of Mandel a sweeping attack on the international miniroty and in particular on the Cdn section . There line is that the opportunist tendency pressures are greater on the international than the right wing pressures---see Canada. He attack us on three counts 1 on Quebec nationalism--he upholds Mike Mill openly. 2- on English Cdn nati nalism--he upholds the PC majority position 3- on the NDP--he attacks LC and the YS for opportunist adaptation to reformism He criticized the very same issue of LC that I criticized our completely uncriticial identity with the NDP at the time of the federal election. I noted on the same issue he criticizes--- astonishing--not a single word that distinguishes us Trotskyists fro the NDP--all the more astonish g when you consider they just moved in on the Waffle. The next issue is a daicsussion on our branch I scored for its advise. not to the left- but to the NDP reform st brass.

As I said we will be se ding a sort of report out of the Sunday meeting.

Let's hear from you.

comradely

Ross Dowson

Page 3 of a letter